

war damage policies hereafter issued; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

434. By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Petition of sundry citizens of Long Island, N. Y., urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

435. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the municipality of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the construction of post-war plans for the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 7, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 6, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, Thou only art the fountain of our being, the light of all our seeing, our helper Thou amid the flood of mortal ills prevailing. Our puny mortal strength is unequal to the tests and tasks of these terrific times which are upon us. The arm of flesh fails us. We dare not trust our own devices and counsels.

Strengthen us, we beseech Thee, in the inner man, by the renewing, sustaining, undergirding grace which is able to keep us from falling and failing. So may our hearts be steadied and stilled, purged of self, emptied of strain and stress, filled with peace and poise, satisfied with each new morning just to wake and find Thee there. For Thine is the kingdom to which the future belongs, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, April 6, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 52. An act for the relief of Hazel M. Lewis;

S. 257. An act for the relief of Christine Lund;

S. 258. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to consider the claim of Lew O. Calhoun;

S. 404. An act for the relief of Richard Barker; and

S. 854. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in

which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 159. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan Ramirez;

H. R. 235. An act for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey;

H. R. 309. An act for the relief of Marion O. Cassady;

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Mary Lynn Morrow, Mrs. W. A. Jones, and the estates of Maurice Jones and Mrs. Avis McDonald;

H. R. 951. An act for the relief of W. Harold Shackelford;

H. R. 1160. An act for the relief of Alva Burton Riskey;

H. R. 1557. An act for the relief of Robert H. Pulliam;

H. R. 1583. An act for the relief of Reuben T. Little;

H. R. 1597. An act for the relief of Joseph Spear;

H. R. 1627. An act for the relief of Vida B. Rogers;

H. R. 1712. An act for the relief of Sarah Ann Elizabeth Holliday Foxworth and Ethel Allene Brown Haberfeld;

H. R. 1784. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay;

H. R. 2067. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. M. Reid & Co., of Macon, Ga.;

H. R. 2089. An act for the relief of Jennie Walker;

H. R. 2172. An act for the relief of Joseph Arraes, also known as Joseph Arraes; and

H. R. 2312. An act for the relief of Everett A. Alden; Robert Bruce; Edgar C. Faris, Jr.; Kathryn W. Ross; Charles L. Rust; and Frederick C. Wright.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 222. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 223. An act to authorize the exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of the Interior;

S. 224. An act to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased;

S. 319. An act to authorize the acceptance of a permanent loan to the United States by the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art, and for other purposes;

S. 427. An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the Army of the United States assigned to diving duty;

S. 800. An act to authorize certain officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to act as notaries public during the existence of war or a national emergency and 6 months thereafter;

S. 829. An act to amend sections 6 and 11 of the act approved July 24, 1941, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," as amended, to provide for the grade of commodore, and for other purposes;

S. 853. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1909, as amended by the act of January 23, 1942, providing for the sale of naval stores, in order to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to permit the sale of naval stores in the continental United States during the war and 6 months thereafter to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and to other

persons at stations where purchase from private agencies is found to be impracticable; and

S. 903. An act to amend section 602 (d) (1) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore [Mr. LUCAS]. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Pepper
Austin	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bailey	Gurney	Reed
Bail	Hatch	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hawkes	Reynolds
Barkley	Hayden	Robertson
Bone	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	Kilgore	Taft
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lodge	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lucas	Truman
Chandler	McCarran	Tunnell
Chavez	McClellan	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Van Nuys
Connally	McNary	Wagner
Danaher	Maloney	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Downey	Millikin	Wheeler
Eastland	Moore	Wherry
Ellender	Murdoch	White
Ferguson	Nye	Wiley
George	O'Daniel	Willis
Gerry	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gillette	Overton	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent on an inspection tour of military camps.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent, holding hearings in the West on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate Small Business Enterprises.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent on account of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is absent on official business as a member of the Small Business Committee of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letter, which was referred as indicated:

INTERCHANGE OF POSTAL CLERKS AND CITY LETTER CARRIERS DURING THE WAR

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably (with an accompanying

paper); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Joint Resolution 18

"Joint resolution relative to the construction of a dam on the Stanislaus River

"Whereas during the winter season the Stanislaus River carries great quantities of storm and floodwaters which add to the flood menace in the valley below; and

"Whereas the impounding of these waters by a dam in the upper reaches of the Stanislaus River would provide for flood control, would make available water for irrigation during the time such water is needed, would provide for the regulation of stream flow in the Stanislaus and the San Joaquin Rivers, and would provide a source of electrical power which is particularly needed in the present war emergency; and

"Whereas the cost of such a dam and its appurtenant works would be more than balanced by the benefits thereof: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to cause to be constructed a multiple purpose dam on the upper reaches of the Stanislaus River to restrain the usual recurring excess flow of water of said river and to utilize the water so impounded for the generation of electric power, for irrigation, for domestic water supply, and for other useful and beneficial purposes; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Senate Substitute for House Joint Memorial 5

"TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AND TO THE HONORABLE ANTHONY J. DIMOND, DELEGATE TO CONGRESS FROM ALASKA:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in sixteenth regular session assembled, respectfully represents:

"That for the past year or more a great amount of confusion and delay has been experienced in the handling of the United States mail to and from the Territory of Alaska, which has been and now is a great handicap to all residents of the Territory of Alaska, officials of the Government, both Federal and Territorial, contractors engaged in defense projects, those engaged in essential lines of business, and all others, entailing long and unwarranted delays in receiving and sending mail, great additional expense, and loss of letters and enclosures.

"That part of this delay may be attributed to war conditions, but a far larger part is apparently due to inefficiency, carelessness, and officials' restrictions and censorship.

"That mails intended for points in southeastern Alaska and for the interior of Alaska via Juneau are frequently loaded on steamers which do not call at Juneau, and they are carried to other points and thus delayed sev-

eral weeks, sometimes months, in reaching their destination.

"That with the existing mail facilities the mail service to and from Alaska could be greatly improved and the time of delivery greatly shortened without any interference with the defense of the country or the war activities of the Army and Navy.

"That mail between Alaska and the United States is censored in Seattle, and this alone entails great delay, inconvenience, and annoyance.

"That some form of censorship of certain mail to and from the Territory may be necessary in time of war, but it seems that the Alaska censorship has been carried to extremes in many instances and apparently carried beyond the real purpose of wartime censorship.

"That it developed at a hearing in Washington before a congressional committee that those censoring the Alaska mail had in many instances taken extracts from letters passing to and from Alaska, oftentimes constituting official mail, and had published these extracts from letters much to the annoyance and inconvenience of Federal and Territorial officials and other inhabitants of the Territory.

"That we realize in time of war all people of every part of the country should be ready and willing to accept inconveniences, sacrifices, and hardship wherever it is necessary for the common good, but the inconveniences and annoyances caused by some of the present practices of those engaged in censoring Alaska mail do not seem to furnish any contribution to the Nation's defense, but have the opposite effect and are a positive detriment and additional burden to all people using the mails.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist respectfully and most earnestly prays that an immediate investigation be made of the handling of the mails to and from Alaska; that a little more care be exercised in dispatching mail both ways: that the censorship be investigated and so administered as to meet the requirements of the Nation while at war, and that the practice of taking or publishing extracts from letters which have no bearing on national defense be immediately discontinued.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the House, March 5, 1943.

"Approved by the Governor, March 23, 1943.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

Two joint memorials of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 9

"TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE, THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AND TO THE HONORABLE ANTHONY J. DIMOND, DELEGATE TO CONGRESS FROM ALASKA:

"Whereas it has been the persistent policy of the Congress of the United States to grant a reasonable amount of home rule unto all the people over which it has plenary power and control; and

"Whereas the President of the United States gave voice to this principle when he recommended to the Congress to 'consider legislation' as soon as possible, to permit the people of Puerto Rico to elect their own Governor:

"Now, therefore, we, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in sixteenth session assembled, respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to consider legislation, as soon as possible, granting unto the people of this Territory the right to elect their own Governor.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house March 18, 1943.

"Approved by the Governor March 23, 1943.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

"House Joint Memorial 10

"TO THE HONORABLE FRANCIS E. BIDDLE, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND TO THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AND TO THE HONORABLE ANTHONY J. DIMOND, DELEGATE TO CONGRESS FROM ALASKA:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in sixteenth regular session assembled, respectfully submits:

"Whereas the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in fifteenth regular session assembled, unanimously adopted House Joint Memorial No. 5, requesting the Congress of the United States to appropriate sufficient money for the construction of a fireproof courthouse and Federal jail at Valdez, Alaska; and

"Whereas the present jail is housed in a rented frame building which is in a deplorable condition, a firetrap which jeopardizes the health and lives of the officials and inmates; and

"Whereas said town of Valdez, since the fire which destroyed the headquarters building of the third judicial division, has been without a court building or adequate office or jail facilities; and

"Whereas, because of the old and dilapidated condition of the present jail, the people of Valdez live in constant fear of jail breaks by dangerous criminals who are kept there pending trial by the District Court; and

"Whereas there now exists no safe and adequate place for the safekeeping of public documents and records of the United States, or marshal's office:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in sixteenth regular session assembled, respectfully petitions that the United States Department of Justice approve, and the Senate and House of Representatives appropriate, a sum of money which would enable the construction at Valdez, Alaska, of a fireproof structure capable of housing court headquarters and a Federal jail at Valdez, Alaska, along with the suggestion that space also be provided in said structure for all other Federal agencies existing and functioning and that said funds be provided and architectural plans for construction be submitted at the earliest possible date.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house March 15, 1943.

"Approved by the Governor March 23, 1943.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of Yates Center, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

A joint resolution of the General Court of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Finance:

"STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

"House Joint Resolution 16

"Joint Resolution relative to a Federal pay-as-you-go plan of taxation.

"Whereas the burden of taxation placed upon the people of this country is very heavy under the present Federal statutes, and

"Whereas some plan should be adopted to distribute this tax in an equitable manner: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is urged to proceed at once to enact the so-called Ruml, or other similar pay-as-you-go plan for paying taxes on present income; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the New Hampshire Senators and Representatives in Congress and to the President of the United

States Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, in Washington.

"Approved March 16, 1943.

"ROBERT O. BLOOD,
"Governor."

By Mr. GILLETTE:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 24

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the Fiftieth Legislature of the State of Iowa (the State House of Representatives concurring therein), That—

"Whereas our Nation is engaged in the greatest war effort of our history, and the President has announced that 11,200,000 men will be in the armed forces of our country by December of this year; and

"Whereas our national economy has been converted from peace to war with several tens of millions of our citizens now engaged in producing the implements of war; and

"Whereas it has been stated by high Government authority that 65,000,000 of our citizens (both in and out of the armed forces) will be engaged in the war effort by the end of this year; and

"Whereas after the war is over the transformation of our country from a total war economy to a civilian peacetime economy, including the complete disruption of employment of fifty to sixty million people, is a problem of which the consequences can be almost as fateful as the result of the war itself unless proper steps are taken now; and

"Whereas it is inevitable that our National Government will of necessity spend many billions of dollars in the post-war period to cushion the transformation of the Nation's economy from war to peace; and

"Whereas it is of the utmost importance that the funds so expended shall be spent on useful work and in an efficient, economical, and businesslike manner so that the Nation will have something of value to show for the money spent after the unemployment problem of the post-war period shall have passed and to the end that the principle of self-help rather than public bounty shall be uppermost; and

"Whereas highway construction is useful work and will be vitally necessary and is one of the best means of providing employment for idle men and produces a durable, necessary public improvement for the convenience and welfare of all our people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Fiftieth General Assembly of the State of Iowa (the House concurring):

"1. That we hereby endorse the proposal submitted to the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and the House Committee on Roads of the National Congress on March 4, 1943, by the American Association of State Highway Officials, for the immediate authorization of \$3,000,000 to be expended on highway construction over a period of 3 years following the close of the war.

"2. That these funds be controlled and expended through the regular highway agencies of the States and the Federal Government, and that no new Federal agencies be created or empowered to handle such work.

"3. That the funds so authorized be allotted among all the States on some equitable fixed formula, to the end that each State will know as soon as the act is passed the approximate amount of such funds it will receive, and plan accordingly.

"4. That the funds so authorized be available for expenditure in the improvement of State primary roads, secondary roads, and municipal streets.

"5. That the work be done under contracts let at open, advertised, competitive, public bidding, to the lowest responsible bidder, and based on fixed, definite plans and specifications, thus avoiding and preventing the

confusion, delay, waste, and extravagance of work done without adequate plans and specifications, or with no plans and specifications.

"6. That the Congress take immediate action on this matter to the end that time may be had to make surveys, prepare plans, secure rights of way, and get ready to let contracts and start construction promptly when the war is over and unemployment becomes acute.

"7. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Iowa and to Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR, chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and Hon. J. W. ROBINSON, chairman of the House Committee on Roads, of the National Congress."

By Mr. McCARRAN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Mines and Mining:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 17

"Assembly joint resolution memorializing Congress to grant relief to the gold mining industry

"Whereas the gold and silver mines of the State of Nevada brought about the admission of the Territory of Nevada into the Nation as the 'Battle Born State' during the dark days of the Civil War; and

"Whereas these mines poured the blood of economic life into a nation whose Treasury was depleted and whose resources were sorely strained by years of war effort; and

"Whereas, by reason of the patriotic efforts of the mining industry of the State of Nevada, the credit of the Nation was strengthened and the final victory was hastened; and

"Whereas the gold mines of the State of Nevada, with lavish hand, through years of peace and war, have continued to pour their wealth into the Nation's economic structure; and

"Whereas the prosperity of the State of Nevada has always been, and now is, geared to the productivity of her gold mines, and many of her towns and communities have had birth and prosperity by reason thereof; and

"Whereas the loyalty of the people of Nevada again supports a nation once more engaged in war to the end that free government may continue to exist; and

"Whereas it has been necessary during the progress of this great war to impose drastic restrictions upon industry as well as upon individuals, all for the purpose of strengthening the Nation's economy and her military might; and

"Whereas among other restrictions heretofore imposed has been that of closing all gold mines and all operations connected therewith, thus striking at the very heart of the prosperity and welfare of the State of Nevada and her most loyal and patriotic people; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Nevada are as willing now as they were during the civil war to give their lives and the fruits of their industry to the Nation that secures to them the priceless privileges of American citizenship, and it is not the thought nor desire of the State of Nevada, nor her people, to question or criticize any order promulgated for the common good; nevertheless the people of the State of Nevada do feel that the order closing the gold mines and all activity connected therewith was not, and is not, conducive to the welfare of the State of Nevada, the Nation, or the general war effort; and

"Whereas the people of the State of Nevada feel that the loss suffered to her citizens and to the owners and operators of her gold mines and industries by reason of such closing order far exceeds the national gain, if any, from such order; and

"Whereas it appears that while certain restrictions have been placed upon the gold-mining industry in Allied Nations, the mines of those nations have continued to operate and produce, thus sustaining the domestic

welfare and economy of such mining districts, this even though many millions of dollars of lend-lease aid is being given by the United States to such allies: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, That the gold-mining industry in the United States should have opportunities equal to those had by the same industry in allied countries receiving lend-lease aid, particularly when the restrictions placed upon our domestic industry upon the premise that our converted gold-mining industry will make possible the production of more essential commodities of war and lend-lease supplies; and be it further

"Resolved, That in this particular instance the gold-mining industry in the United States is the national stepchild, denied the right to protect and preserve the many millions of dollars invested, while compelled to labor in the so-called essential industries to the end that the sinews of war and lend-lease material may be shipped to other nations in which gold mining continues to flourish, affected only by the ordinary results of a war economy; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States give its considered thought to the discriminatory nature of the gold-mine-closing order, both as to the local effect and its international aspect; that Congress consider the little good that has been accomplished by such order as against the great local harm that has been done in every gold-mining district in the United States, and particularly in the State of Nevada; and be it further

"Resolved, That if the order cannot be rescinded, that Congress enact suitable legislation compensating the industry for the great financial burden and loss unfairly and discriminatingly imposed on it through being required to pay greatly increased taxes on idle property and equipment, interest on millions of investment denied a right to earn, millions expended to prevent watering and deterioration of mine workings, and in the maintenance of improvements generally;

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, to our Senators and Congressmen at Washington, D. C., and that copies of this resolution, certified by the proper officers of the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, be transmitted to the legislatures of the several Western States now in session.

"State of Nevada, Executive Department: approved, March 24, 1943.

"E. P. CARVILLE,
"Governor."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Senate joint resolution memorializing Congress to effect a land grant to the State of Nevada comprising 200,000 acres

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Nevada, hereby respectfully represents that

"Whereas the acreage granted the State of Nevada by the United States was far deficient as compared with the grants made to the other public land States, as shown by the fact that the other 10 public land States received an average of 9.1 percent of the total area embraced within their boundaries, as compared to 3.8 percent granted the State of Nevada; and

"Whereas through the passage of the Taylor Grazing Act approved June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended, all of the public domain within the State of Nevada was withdrawn from all forms of entry except mineral, which act virtually stopped the alienation of public lands to private interests; and

"Whereas section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act, approved June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269),

as amended (which provides for exchanges of land with the Government), has proven inadequate, ambiguous, and inoperative to the point where the lapse of time necessary to consummate an exchange is prohibitive and impracticable; and

"Whereas a definite need exists for more available State land to offer prospective settlers, which fact is borne out by the numerous requests to the State land office by people interested in acquiring business sites, home sites, and small ranches in our State; and

"Whereas the State of Nevada at the present time has only 126,000 acres of State land subject to entry, all of which is a decided handicap to the largest public land State in the Union, considering the degree of undevelopment and the fact that it is on the threshold of an unprecedented economic expansion; and

"Whereas there now exists in the State of Nevada, under the jurisdiction of the grazing service, several millions of acres of land not suited for grazing, for which reason said lands should not be permitted to continue under the jurisdiction of the grazing service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Nevada (the Assembly concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Nevada make, and that said legislature hereby does make, application to the Congress of the United States for a land grant consisting of 200,000 acres, which grant shall be known as the State school grant. The selection of land embraced in this grant shall be made under the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the selection and sale of lands that have been or may hereafter be granted by the United States to the State of Nevada," approved March 12, 1885. The selections shall be made subject to the approval of the Nevada regional grazier of the Grazing Service, Department of the Interior, and all revenue derived from the sale of this land shall be deposited in the State treasury, to be used only for the benefit of State schools; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly certified copy of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Committees on Public Lands of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and to each of our Senators and our Representative in Congress.

"State of Nevada, executive department: Approved March 20, 1943.

*"E. P. CARVILLE,
Governor."*

JOINT MEMORIAL OF NEW MEXICO LEGISLATURE—DESIGNATION OF ALAMOGORDO AIR BASE AS JACK LEE FIELD

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, for reasons which are set forth in the memorial which I present for printing in the RECORD, under the rule, and ask to have referred to the appropriate committee, it gives me pleasure to send to the desk the memorial in question for such disposition.

There being no objection, the joint memorial was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 8

Joint memorial memorializing the President of the United States and the War Department of the United States to designate that certain air field now known as the Alamogordo Air Base, as the Jack Lee Field

Whereas on the morning of November 18, 1942, First Lt. Jack Lee, copilot, squadron commander, Twenty-sixth Squadron, Elev-

enth Bombardment Group of the Seventh Air Force, as copilot and member of the striking force of 11 heavy bombardment airplanes, proceeded on a mission to bomb Japanese shipping at Buin-Tonolei, near Kahlili Airfield in the Solomon Islands; and reaching the target area, bombing runs were made through extremely heavy antiaircraft fire and fighter opposition, which resulted in the destruction of one enemy transport and damage to other ships; and

Whereas immediately following this action, Lieutenant Lee was mortally wounded in a frontal attack on his airplane by an enemy fighter pilot, but carried on with his duties for some time; and

Whereas the plane was forced to make a water landing and while rowing to shore, Lieutenant Lee lost his life; and

Whereas Lieutenant Lee received his wings at Luke Field, Ariz., going to Hawaii in January 1942; and

Whereas he participated in the Battle of Midway and also in the Battle at Guadalcanal August 4, 1942, and was stationed in the Solomon Islands area from that time until his death on November 18, 1942; and

Whereas Lieutenant Lee was posthumously awarded the Silver Star decoration for gallantry in action against the enemy on November 18, 1942, the day he met his death; and

Whereas Lieutenant Lee was also awarded the Air Medal for meritorious achievement while participating in an air combat mission against enemy objectives on October 12, 1942, and was also awarded the Purple Heart decoration posthumously; and

Whereas Lt. Jack Lee, the son of Oliver M. Lee, deceased, and Winnie P. Lee, was born in Otero County, a native son of New Mexico; and

Whereas, Lt. Jack Lee, by his life and his heroic death, has set a noble example to the young men of the State of New Mexico; and

Whereas it seems fitting and proper that a perpetual monument to his memory be established in the county of his birth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the senators and members of the House of Representatives of the Sixteenth Legislature of the State of New Mexico do hereby petition the President of the United States and the War Department of the United States to establish such a perpetual monument to his memory by designating that certain air base located in Otero County, State of New Mexico, now known as the Alamogordo Air Base as the Jack Lee Field; and be it further

Resolved, That engrossed copies of this joint memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of War, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Senators and Representatives of New Mexico in Congress.

Approved by me this 30th day of March 1943.

*JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
Governor of New Mexico.*

INVESTIGATION OF LABOR SHORTAGES IN CERTAIN WESTERN STATES—ASSIGNMENT OF GOVERNMENTAL REPRESENTATIVES TO ACCOMPANY SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, on behalf of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 113, and Senate Resolution 107, with an amendment. I desire to have unanimous consent to have the resolutions considered at this time. They provide further appropriations for investigations which are already in progress and for which small

additional amounts of money are needed in order to carry the investigations through to success.

I understand there will be no debate on the resolutions. One of them has to do with an investigation of labor and transportation difficulties on the west coast, and the other has to do with the military.

Mr. McNARY. The able chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate being in the chair at present, I ask the Senator from Maryland whether the resolutions received the unanimous support of the committee.

Mr. TYDINGS. They did.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask that the first resolution, Senate Resolution 113, be considered at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 113), submitted by Mr. Downey on March 12, 1943.

The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was on page 1, line 15, after the words "increased by", to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, and the Director of Defense Transportation are each requested to assign a representative of their respective departments or agencies to accompany the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, appointed pursuant to Senate Resolution 88, Seventy-eighth Congress (relating to an investigation of the existing shortage of labor in the Pacific Coast and Rocky Mountain States and the effect of such shortage upon the war effort), to such places as may be necessary for the purpose of participating in such investigation and in hearings held in connection therewith.

The limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased by \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BETTER MOBILIZATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 107.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 107), submitted by Mr. MURRAY (for Mr. KILGORE), on February 22, 1943. The amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was on page 2, line 9, after the words "shall not exceed", to strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the subcommittee on technological mobilization of the Military Affairs Committee is authorized and directed to study the possibilities of better mobilizing the national resources of the United States for the more efficient prosecution of the war. The subcommittee shall report to the Military Affairs Committee from time to time the re-

sults of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purpose of this resolution, the subcommittee is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ or borrow from Government agencies and departments such clerical, special, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$5,000, in addition to the cost of stenographic services to report such hearings, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

INVESTIGATIONS BY MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE RELATING TO MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 131), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make such investigations and studies with respect to the Military Establishment as the committee deems advisable or expedient to keep the committee fully informed with respect thereto and to enable it to properly perform its functions in connection with matters referred to it. The committee shall report to the Senate from time to time the action taken by it pursuant to this resolution.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$100,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 969. A bill for the relief of D. T. George; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 970. A bill authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably; and

S. 971. A bill to supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of greatly needed highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad-grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way, to cushion the post-war conversion to peacetime economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 972. A bill to amend section 7 (c) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417); and

S. 973. A bill to amend sections 2 and 4 of the act approved June 27, 1942, entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 974 (by request). A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide that individuals who have completed at least 35 years of service may retire on a full annuity, without regard to age; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 975. A bill to provide for speedy and summary notice in proceedings to condemn property for war purposes, and to accelerate the distribution of deposits and awards to the persons entitled thereto in such cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 976 (by request). A bill to increase the amount of the family allowances payable to dependent parents of enlisted men in the military and naval forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 977. A bill to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act of February 17, 1911, as amended, to provide for the appointment of five additional inspectors, and to provide for adjustments in salaries; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 978. A bill relating to certain lands released to the United States by carriers by railroad pursuant to section 321 (b) of the Transportation Act of 1940; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 159. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Juan Ramirez;

H. R. 235. An act for the relief of Forrest W. Dickey;

H. R. 309. An act for the relief of Marion O. Cassidy;

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Mary Lynn Morrow, Mrs. W. A. Jones, and the estates of Maurice Jones and Mrs. Avis McDonald;

H. R. 951. An act for the relief of W. Harold Shackelford;

H. R. 1160. An act for the relief of Alva Burton Rickey;

H. R. 1557. An act for the relief of Robert H. Pulliam;

H. R. 1583. An act for the relief of Reuben T. Little;

H. R. 1597. An act for the relief of Joseph Spear;

H. R. 1627. An act for the relief of Vida B. Rogers;

H. R. 1712. An act for the relief of Sarah Ann Elizabeth Holliday Foxworth and Ethel Allene Brown Haberfeld;

H. R. 1784. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard L. Gay;

H. R. 2067. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of H. M. Reid & Co., of Macon, Ga.;

H. R. 2089. An act for the relief of Jennie Walker; and

H. R. 2312. An act for the relief of Everett A. Alden; Robert Bruce; Edgar C. Faris, Jr.; Kathryn W. Ross; Charles L. Rust; and Frederick C. Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2172. An act for the relief of Joseph Arraes, also known as Joseph Arraes; to the Committee on Immigration.

FLORIDA BARGE CANAL—AMENDMENT TO WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BARBOUR, and Mr. CONNALLY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill (H. R. 2346) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 9, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

"FLORIDA BARGE CANAL

"For the construction of the barge canal from the St. Johns River across Florida to the Gulf of Mexico, authorized in Public Law 675, Seventy-seventh Congress, including all incidental expenses such as may be incurred under the appropriation 'Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works,' to be available immediately, \$44,000,000."

OLEOMARGARINE OR BUTTER SUBSTITUTES FOR VETERANS' FACILITIES—AMENDMENT TO INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 1762, the independent offices appropriation bill, 1944, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 62, line 2, before the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of oleomargarine or butter substitutes, except for cooking purposes, but if the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs finds at any time that the procurement of an adequate butter supply is not feasible, this appropriation shall be available for the purchase of oleomargarine or butter substitutes to the extent that such Administrator finds to be necessary to meet the requirements of the Veterans' Administration facilities for other than cooking purposes."

REPORTS ON WAGE INCREASES FROM NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

Mr. BYRD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 130), which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That the National War Labor Board is authorized and directed to submit to

the Senate as soon as practicable (1) an analysis of the effect of its decisions and orders since January 12, 1942, which have directed, authorized, or approved wage increases and reclassifications of employees, with the total cost of all such wage increases, together with a statement of the changes (expressed in percentages and amounts) in the basic hourly rates of wages and the average weekly earnings which have resulted from such decisions and orders in the case of each employer or industry affected thereby; (2) a statement with respect to any action taken by the Board since January 12, 1942, for the purposes of increasing substandard wages and correcting inequalities in wages, together with illustrative examples of situations in which, in the opinion of the Board, substandard wages and inequalities in wages exist and which in effect constitute a definition of such substandard wages and inequalities; and (3) a statement with respect to all cases in which wage increases have been authorized or approved by the Board which constitute a departure from the so-called Little Steel formula; (4) the first report shall be made not later than May 1, 1943, and thereafter the War Labor Board is directed to furnish a report on the 1st day of each month to the Senate containing this information.

THE WORK OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE WAR PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TRUMAN

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "The Work of the Committee to Investigate the War Program," delivered by Senator TRUMAN before the Chamber of Commerce, Cleveland, Ohio, April 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHEN PEACE COMES, WHAT?—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "When Peace Comes, What?" delivered by him on March 28, 1943, at a public forum on post-war problems, held at the Appleton Vocational Schools, at Appleton, Wis., which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL STABILIZATION OF CURRENCIES

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record the text of the Treasury statement on post-war monetary problems issued on April 6, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MANPOWER PROBLEM—ARTICLE BY FRANK R. KENT

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article discussing manpower, by Frank R. Kent, from the Washington Star of April 2, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WAR SECURITY BILL—EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON EVENING AMERICAN

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Defeat 'Gestapo Bill'," from the Boston Evening American of April 5, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORGANIZATION AND COLLABORATION OF UNITED NATIONS—NEWSPAPER COMMENT

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "The Senate Resolution," published in the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator of March 15, 1943, and an article by Russell Weisman published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of March 25, 1943, which appear in the Appendix.]

PREVENTION OF DEDUCTIONS IN DETERMINING PARITY OR COMPARABLE PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—VETO

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (S. 660) to prevent certain deductions in determining parity or comparable prices of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] to refer Senate bill 660, with the accompanying veto message, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate, I hope briefly, on the motion to refer the President's veto message, and the bill involved in the message, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am opposed to referring the bill and the message to that committee or to any other committee, for reasons which I shall give in a few moments. I am also opposed to overriding the veto of the President, for reasons which I shall also present.

I realize the very natural embarrassment which many Members of the Senate feel, and always feel, in regard to the Presidential veto of a measure in which they are interested, or which they have supported. Frequently when a veto message has come to the Senate in ordinary times it has been a matter of routine to send it to a committee, or to the committee from which the bill involved emanated, with the understanding, which has usually been carried out, that the bill and veto message would not again be taken up.

When I was approached on the floor of the Senate yesterday in private conversation and asked if I would agree to a reference of the President's veto message of Senate bill 660 to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I indicated that I would agree provided it were understood that the bill was not to be brought back to the Senate and that such reference would be regarded as final action on it. That was not agreed to by the proponents of the pending motion, and notwithstanding what the Senate may do in regard to the motion to refer, I intend to vote against the motion, if mine shall be the only vote cast against it in this body.

In my opinion, it is not becoming in the Senate, in this great crisis and juncture of our affairs, to try to walk a tightrope on this or any other problem which we face. People go to a circus to see tightrope walkers; they should not be expected to come to the Senate in order to see that sort of a performance; and I say that without any intention to offend. But, in view of many private conferences and conversations to which I have been a party, I have not been able to divest myself of the idea that there is a feeling among many Senators that in order to avoid going on record on the veto message of the President, the smart thing to do is to send it to a committee.

It has been urged also that it should be sent to the committee in order that

it might be kept behind the door as a club against wage increases for labor, with particular reference to the United Mine Workers and John L. Lewis. I realize that some Members speak of John L. Lewis here in whispers. Most Members seem afraid to express their opinion of him in the open, one way or the other. I have been approached and urged to support this motion to refer the veto message to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry so that it may be held as a club over Lewis, in order that, if by any sort of decision the United Mine Workers whom Lewis represents should receive an increase in wages, then the bill would be brought back to the Senate and acted upon in the light of any increase in wages which might be given to the miners by any agency of the Government set up to deal with questions of wages.

Mr. President, I want to be perfectly frank with the Senate. I have always been. I have no reason to be otherwise. Whatever one may think of John L. Lewis, I do not suppose anyone will discount his ability. He is a very able man. He is a very skillful and able strategist in all matters involving the welfare and the wages of the United Mine Workers of the United States. If the veto message of Senate bill 660 is to be used as a club by somebody against somebody, I am not so certain that the club will not be used the other way. If it is to be used as a club, if it is to be sent to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in order to be held there as a club, I am not so certain that in the scuffle to get possession of that club Mr. Lewis may not come out with the club, instead of the Congress of the United States, because, as I have said, he is a very skillful and able leader of his people. If some Senators may not think so, I suggest that they consult the Truman committee, which brought Mr. Lewis before it the other day to testify about some things concerning which they wanted to inquire.

Mr. President, I have a profound respect, as everyone knows, for this body. When I think of the Senate of the United States I think of the outstanding figures who have honored this body from the beginning of our history. I think of a body where Webster thundered, and Henry Clay charmed, where John C. Calhoun shook his ample locks before his colleagues. I do not like to think of this body, and I refuse to think of it in the midst of a great crisis such as this as merely being a temporizing body of men seeking the easiest way to dispose of something which is embarrassing.

I realize also that it is embarrassing frequently for men to reverse their position on measures on which they have taken a position, and on which they have voted. I am in that class. I not only voted for this bill when it was before the Senate, I made a speech in favor of it. But I am not embarrassed. Someone has said, "Consistency, thou art a jewel." Someone else has said, "A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds." Senators may take their choice as to the definition of "consistency." Every man will be the judge of his own attitude and

his own consistency and his own obligation, but the only consistent attitude I feel I can take is to do my duty on each day as I see it on that day, and if my record may present devious lines which cannot be described as straight, or the shortest distance between two points, I will answer either to my constituents or to my conscience, and I am sure every other Senator feels the same way about it.

Mr. President, we have had a temperate discussion of the question before us, as the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] so ably and convincingly stated yesterday in that great speech which he made toward the conclusion of yesterday's session. It was a great speech. I have not heard a better one from him or from anyone else. It was a speech marked by deep conviction as well as profound emotion and a high sense of duty, which lifted me out of the bog and mire of little things, I hope onto a firmer foundation and understanding of our problems in this Nation and in the Senate. I am glad that the debate so far on the whole situation has been temperate, judicious, and free from bitterness, and I am glad that the President's message was pitched on the same high level. In my judgment, it is the best veto message the President has sent to Congress; the most logical, the most temperate, the most reasonable since he has been President of the United States. However much anyone may disagree with him, either as to the facts which he submitted, or as to his reasoning, I think it must be conceded that the President is entitled to the same degree of sincerity on our part as we expect from him and from our colleagues. So far as I am concerned, I do not propose to say or do anything or intimate anything that would in any way mar the high tone upon which this discussion has been pitched. But I am not embarrassed in the slightest degree by the fact that I voted for the bill upon its passage.

Mr. President, there is much mystery and confusion, not only in the minds of the farmers, of whom I am one, but in the minds of others. As I have said heretofore on this floor, I am a member of the Farm Bureau Federation, which has been one of the active organizations of farmers advocating this proposed legislation. There has been much confusion among the farmers, as there has been in the Senate, and as there still is, in regard to the complications involved in the question of parity, and parity payments, and soil conservation payments, and other benefit payments. When we wrote the original law, as I said the other day, we provided a formula for parity. That formula was flexible, and must remain and will remain flexible. The higher the cost goes of the things the farmer must buy, the higher goes the parity formula, because that formula was intended to reflect an equality of his purchasing power now, his relative purchasing power, with that which he enjoyed in the base period from 1909 to 1914. Every time anything the farmer buys goes up in price, automatically parity goes up, and

it is the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture from time to time to adjust the formula so that the purchasing power of the farmer, represented by his prices, no matter how high the ordinary things he must buy may go, will be reflected in that increase.

Mr. President, it is a mistake to assume that farmers buy only the things which are produced in factories. There are supposed to be 6,000,000 farmers in the United States. Very few, if any, of them are self-sustaining. They do not even produce all they eat and wear. They buy many things as articles of food which they cannot themselves produce; and the articles they buy—the food, the articles of clothing, many of them made out of wool taken from their own sheep—go into the general equation which makes up the price they must pay for what they buy, and such price goes into the formula used in deciding what parity shall be. So "parity" is not a static conception and never can be. It is flexible, and was intended to be, and has operated in that manner.

In fixing a ceiling on agricultural prices we either have to include all the farmer gets from the Government or we have to exclude it. We either have to take it away, or we have to add it. It is not merely a neutral quantity floating around in midair. It must be taken into consideration. If we take from it or if we add to it, we do not necessarily change the formula of parity which Congress has written. We cannot fix one parity formula or a parity ceiling for all those who draw benefits from the Government and fix another ceiling for those who do not do so. The ceiling on cotton is bound to be the same for those who cooperate in the cotton program and for those who do not cooperate in the program. The same thing is true as to corn, wheat, tobacco, rice, and every other comparable agricultural product. We cannot provide one ceiling for those who draw benefits and a separate ceiling for those who do not draw benefits. If we add the benefits to the ceiling price, we add them to the price received by all those who do not cooperate and who do not draw benefits, and the latter constitute about two-thirds of the farmers of the United States, for, approximately only 38 percent of the farmers of this country cooperate in the soil-conservation and the various other programs. Sixty-two percent of the farmers do not cooperate in those programs. But if we are going to fix a ceiling high enough to include such payments for the benefit of those who are cooperating and who receive them, we must fix a ceiling high enough to include the two-thirds who do not cooperate, and thereby they will derive the benefit of those payments just as if they were cooperating. It seems to me there is no logical escape from that conclusion.

So it means that in addition to the \$512,000,000, as I believe the figure was stated the other day when we were talking about the amount of all the benefits—\$502,000,000 or \$512,000,000; am I correct about that?

Mr. BANKHEAD. The appropriations are approximately \$212,000,000 and \$450,000,000 for the present fiscal year.

Mr. BARKLEY. About \$662,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is the total appropriation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. But let me call the Senator's attention to the fact, since he has asked the question, that the Senator has talked about 62 percent of the farmers as not cooperating. My information is that nearly 6,000,000 farmers of the six and one-half million cooperate under the soil-conservation program.

Mr. BARKLEY. That information is very different from the information I have received.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have the figures.

Mr. BARKLEY. The relationship is 38 percent and 62 percent. However, be that as it may, what I was about to say was that, whether the amount which is drawn from the Treasury for soil conservation and parity and other benefits amounts to \$512,000,000 or \$662,000,000, when we come to calculate the cost of living to the consumer who buys the products after they have been processed and turned over from time to time, we find that the general public is not only required to pay either \$512,000,000 or \$662,000,000, as the case may be, but in addition, is required to pay whatever has been added to that amount or the result of the multiplication of that amount before the consumer finally buys the product at the retail store. According to the statistics of the Department of Agriculture, over a long period the farmer received 52 percent of the dollar which the consumer paid for farm products. The other 48 percent went to those who are the middlemen, or, as we used to say, the processors and distributors. I think the percentage for the farm part of that dollar is a little higher now; probably it has gone up to 54 percent; but, roughly speaking, the farmer receives a fraction more than half of the dollar which you and I and everyone else in the country pay for what he has produced. So if we multiply that amount by only two, the result is that because of this proposed legislation the public would have to pay more than \$1,000,000,000 for the things which go on their tables and on their backs. If we add the increased price that an increased ceiling would give to those who draw no benefits and who do not participate in the program of the Department of Agriculture, the increased cost would amount, in my judgment, to from a billion and a half dollars to two billion dollars.

Of course, those figures are bound to be estimates; no one can be exact about the matter. We always accept the figures which agree with our theory, and if the figures do not agree with our theory we denounce the statisticians. That is a perfectly natural way of dealing with figures. I used to hear an old adage, down home, that there are three kinds of liars in the world: liars, damn liars, and statisticians. That all depends on whether the figures which are brought in array by the statistician agree with

our theory. However, I think it is fair to say that the result, at least in terms of the final cost to the consuming public, would run from a billion and a half to two billion dollars. It may be that that makes no difference; it may be that we are not concerned about that; it may be that we ought not stop even to debate it; but, after all, there are in this country men and women who are not drawing high wages. There are men who go down into the bowels of the earth to bring out the essentials of our life and our prosperity. Living in the great centers of population are men who for the time being may be drawing more than an average wage. They, as individuals and as a part of the population of this great Nation, are entitled to some consideration from us. They are entitled to have us give consideration to the question whether by our action we are going to break down the controls, relax the restrictions, and destroy the economic structure which we have tried to set up as a part of the war program. We cannot break it down in one place without inviting its collapse all along the line.

I have contended all along, and I still contend, that the farmers of the United States are not dissatisfied with the prices they are getting. I am not going to refer to the multiplication table or the statistics showing how much more or how much less the farmer's income has increased, or showing how someone else's income has increased. The question which confronts me now in the performance of my duty on this inflation front is whether the farmer of the United States, as a part, an essential and indispensable part, of the productive energy of our people, considering all the elements which enter into it, considering the war effort itself, considering the absolute necessity for us to keep these curbs within control, or else to lose control, is receiving his fair share of the reward to which he is entitled, to which our energies for years have been bent, and to which he should be entitled to receive for the products he brings out of the ground.

I represent an agricultural State, which produces all sorts of agricultural commodities—grain, hay, cotton, corn, wheat, livestock of every kind, rye, hemp, alfalfa, lespedeza, clover, and other kinds of grasses. Next to North Carolina I believe it is the largest tobacco-producing State in the Union, running North Carolina a very close race. The State of Kentucky is an average agricultural State. Its agriculture is probably more diversified than that of many other States.

I receive letters from my constituents, as other Senators do from theirs. I have not received any letters from farmers in Kentucky complaining about the prices they are receiving. The complaints which have been made are the same as the complaints which have been made to other Senators about the labor situation and, in the absence of a sufficient quantity of labor, the farm-implement situation, which I am glad to say is being given immediate attention in the effort to assure the farmers more machinery

to take the place of their boys. There may not be time now to do very much about machinery for the cultivation of crops in time to affect the spring planting, but there certainly is time to do something about machinery with respect to the harvesting of crops.

When the Pace bill was before the Senate I made this statement:

I represent an agricultural State. We produce a variety of farm crops.

I named some of them.

I have not received any complaints from the farmers of my State about the prices they are receiving. The greatest complaint of the farmers of my State and of farmers all over the country is because of the labor situation. They will produce, at the prices they are now receiving, all the farm products they can grow with the labor they have. There is no question about that.

I repeat that statement now. The farmers of the United States will produce, at the prices they are receiving, all they can grow with the labor they have available. There is no doubt about it.

I have before me a letter which I received from the editor of a weekly newspaper, which is published in my State, and which circulates among the farmers. He says:

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have taken the enclosed clipping from your remarks in the Senate last Thursday upon the subject of farm prices. . . . I am writing to say I think it presents a perfect picture of the farmer's attitude in relation to prices. Of course, my horizon is limited, but Harding County, I believe, represents a fair cross section of farming conditions in this State. I have not heard a single farmer here complain as to the price he is receiving. In fact, most of them are prosperous and more than satisfied.

I have received a telegram from a farmer in Trail City, S. Dak. I am sure the Senator from South Dakota knows where Trail City is, but I do not.

MR. THOMAS of Idaho. I know where it is.

MR. BARKLEY. The Senator from Idaho says he knows where it is. This farmer says:

Don't worry about prices.

I do not know why he has sent this telegram to me from South Dakota, but I am glad to have it.

Don't worry about prices. See that we get our implements in order that we may produce and harvest crops.

Those are samples of the telegrams and letters which I have received. I received a telegram from the secretary of the Farm Bureau Federation in Kentucky, urging me to vote to override the veto of the President. I have the greatest respect for Mr. Calvert, who sent me the telegram.

I have a telegram from a local chairman of the board of directors of the Farm Bureau Federation in one county in my State. Except for those two telegrams, I have received no communication from my State urging me to vote to override the President's veto. I respect these men. I know how sincere they are. I know how devoted they are to the farmer's welfare. I have often said,

and I now repeat, that the Farm Bureau Federation is one of the most effective farm organizations that has ever existed in the United States, not only from the standpoint of agricultural interests, but also in other ways. I have the greatest respect for it, and I have cooperated with it ever since it was organized. But there come times in the lives of all of us when we must be our own judges, not only as to our duty, but as to the wisdom of the advice which we receive as to how we shall vote.

Mr. President, I could continue at great length to show the effect of the bill upon the prices of flour, poultry, hogs, and other products. There is scarcely a farmer who produces corn and wheat or other feed grains who does not also raise cattle and hogs. By no means do all of them grow their own feed. Many of them are required to buy it.

The War Department, the Agriculture Department, and all the other departments concerned with the organization and equipment of an army have insisted that we must produce larger quantities of meat. A soldier cannot march all day or fight all day on a vegetarian diet. He must have meat. Because of that situation, soldiers have eaten and are now eating more meat than they would eat if they were at home following their ordinary peaceful pursuits. Therefore, it has been necessary to concentrate on furnishing meats, not only to our own armed forces but to a large extent for our lend-lease program. So the larger our Army and Navy become, the greater the quantities of meat the Government must buy. The larger our lend-lease contributions become, the greater the quantities of meat the Government must buy.

It is estimated in the message of the President and by the Administrator of the O. P. A. that, in addition to the amount which would be added to the cost of living to the 130,000,000 people of the United States, the Government would have to pay another \$500,000,000 to buy the necessary food, clothing, and other materials to equip the Army of the United States.

Senators may believe or disbelieve those figures as they see fit. They may regard them or disregard them as they are inclined to do. I have no power of persuasion to induce Senators to accept them if they do not wish to do so. Other Senators have just as much right to their own interpretations as I have to mine.

MR. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. BARKLEY. I yield.

MR. BANKHEAD. The difference between the parity prices and the market prices of the three principal commodities involved is as follows:

Corn, 8½ cents—600,000,000 bushels cash sales—amount of payments \$51,000,000.

Wheat, 20 cents—700,000,000 bushels—making the payments \$140,000,000.

Sugar, \$60,000,000.

So a total of \$251,000,000 represents the difference between the market price and the parity price.

I ask the Senator, in fairness and in reason, to explain how approximately

\$250,000,000—which will be paid to the farmers anyway, but by the consumers of the United States instead of the taxpayers, assuming it is all paid—can be reconciled with such a stupendous figure as a billion and a half dollars.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has given only the figure for parity, the difference between the market price and the parity price.

Mr. BANKHEAD. A ceiling can be put on when parity is reached.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has not taken into consideration the amount of soil conservation payments involved in the bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am taking into consideration the entire difference, however it may be paid, between the market price and parity price. When the prices reach parity, ceilings can be put on them, and that would be at \$251,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator knows that the question of soil-conservation payments has no relationship to parity. Farmers receive such payments anyway, whether there is parity or not.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator is not proposing to change that arrangement, is he?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I am not proposing to change it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Then, why bring it into the debate?

Mr. BARKLEY. Because the Senator's bill and the President's veto concerned not only parity payments, but soil-conservation payments, and all other benefits which the farmer receives.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator is including both soil-conservation and parity payments, and there is a difference of only \$251,000,000 between the parity prices and the market prices.

Mr. BARKLEY. With all due respect to my good friend, I shall have to differ from him as to the amount. The figure \$251,000,000 includes parity, but not all other payments.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Due to the spread.

Mr. BARKLEY. Spread is a different proposition.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It shows how much additional money has to be spent; that is all.

Mr. BARKLEY. But there would be added to whatever ceiling it would be necessary to put on these products, parity payments, soil-conservation payments, and other benefits, which I need not detail. I do not believe there is any doubt that the amount of the appropriation for that purpose is \$662,000,000. Whether it will all be paid out I cannot now say.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator understands the amount to be paid out is decreased as the market prices increase.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true. The amount to be paid out for parity purposes would, of course, completely vanish if all crops were bringing parity prices.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in conclusion I desire to say a word relative to the pending motion. I have no way of knowing how the Senate will vote on it. I think we now have reached such a juncture in the history of the country that the American people have a right

to expect the Senate, the whole Congress, and those conducting the war effort, to meet the issue and the test. We cannot dilly-dally much longer with this question of inflation and uncertainty. That is true not only with respect to farm prices, wages, and profits, but of everything else involved in the compensation men are to receive for what they do. We know there is confusion at the present time. If it could have been done, I believe it would have been better at the very beginning for the O. P. A. to have fixed ceilings on all commodities, and advised the American people what those ceilings were to be, instead of fooling along with one commodity at a time, and announcing a week or a month in advance that they would do a certain thing at the end of a certain period providing something else might happen which did not happen.

We cannot remedy that situation. It may have been inevitable. It may be that the O. P. A. could not obtain all the information necessary to put into effect an over-all policy. But certainly one of the criticisms and one of the complaints which the American people have is that there is a lack of understanding of the rationing program. I do not believe we can play with it any longer. I believe the American people have a right to expect Congress to let them know where it stands upon these matters.

Mr. President, the issue is clear-cut: Shall we sustain the President's veto, or shall we override it? The people of the country have a right to know what we are going to do about it. I agreed with the Senator from North Carolina yesterday when he spoke of the Members of the United States Senate, two from each State, in whom the people have reposed their faith and confidence, and whom they know and trust, and I think they have a right to expect us to stand against the varying winds which blow in every direction, in order that we may take counsel of our fears, not knowing always which course will reflect the greatest degree of political wisdom.

We hear much about elections and re-elections; we hear much about fourth terms and third terms. In my honest judgment, the American people are not now concerned about a fourth term for anybody in the United States, including United States Senators, some of whom may be running next year for their fourth terms.

I believe that I express the views of every Member of the Senate in what I am about to say. If I did not think so, I would not say so. If I did not believe I expressed their views I myself would not have the great confidence in this deliberative body which I have, and which I always have had, and have always expressed. I do not believe there is a Senator on this floor who, if he could win the war or contribute to winning the war by sacrificing his political life, would not do so. What right have we to play with the destiny of our Nation, and with the lives, limbs, and blood of our millions of boys, who are not at the battle front as Democrats or Republicans, who are not there as farmers, or

millers, or mechanics, or clerks, or lawyers, or doctors? They are at the front as Americans. Their politics was not considered or consulted when the strong arm of our Nation reached into their homes and took them and put them into uniforms. Many of them will never return. Many of them will find graves in alien lands, as many already have. As we debate this question today our hearts are on every continent in the world, because our boys are on every island, on every continent, in every sky, and on every sea. There may be millions of casualties before the war shall end. When the casualty lists begin to come in there will be many sorrowful men in the Senate, as there have already been, because of the loss of their dearly beloved. With the greatest respect and admiration and affection for my colleagues, may I express the fervent hope that our conduct here may not in the slightest degree be controlled and determined by our desire to see that there are no political casualties on the floor of the United States Senate.

In this country, we hear much grumbling which is fed and fanned by those who thrive on discontent. We hear much grumbling because of the numerous inconveniences we must undergo in carrying on the war effort. Of course, we have got to change and lower and modify our standard of living. The man who has been in the habit for years of buying two automobiles each year cannot now buy one. Of course, that is a modification and a lowering of his standard. The man who buys each year two or three suits of clothes now can buy only one. That is a lowering of his standard; but he has not suffered any hardship.

There is no sacrifice we can make on the home front, whether in the price of labor, or of agricultural products, or of manufactured products, or in the price of political office at any election—and I include all elective officers of this Republic—there is no sacrifice, no inconvenience, no hardship we can endure that deserves to be mentioned in the same breath with the hardships which are being endured by the boys in uniform, and by the girls and women also, on the dry sands of North Africa, and in the Solomon Islands, in New Guinea, in India, in China, in swamps and bogs and miasmas and perpetual malarias, where they not only are required to fight, but to sleep and to eat in the mud and mire and slime. There is no sacrifice, no inconvenience, no hardship, no lowering of our standard of life we are compelled to endure that deserves to be mentioned in the same breath with the sacrifices these men are required to make in order that our Nation, its traditions, and the liberties which we enjoy may be preserved. When I think of that comparison and receive letters from persons who evidently have not thought things through, who are only concerned about their own little spheres and the little deprivation they are called upon in behalf of the war effort to undergo, I grow sick at heart.

I think the American people are determined, on the whole, to make whatever sacrifice and contribution may be necessary in order to win this war, whatever

may have been their attitude prior to our entry into it. As we all know, there were many honest people who disagreed about it; but, regardless of that, I think their determination is to win the war and to win it unequivocally and without reservation. I do not believe they will be willing to make the sacrifices the 11,000,000 men in the armed forces, or perhaps more than 11,000,000, must make before it is over unless out of it shall come a complete victory not only in the war, but a complete victory so far as the world is concerned hereafter in the way of trying to preserve and perpetuate peace and good will among men.

I think these millions of people have the right to ask us today, Are you for the veto or are you against it? Let us not sidestep it; let us not park it out yonder in a committee where another agricultural bill has been parked and where hearings I believe are now in progress. Do not give to other people a club with which to beat you into insensibility by encouraging them to hold off in their effort and come to an agreement about other things. Do not deceive yourself into the belief that you can put a club behind the door in any committee of the Senate without running the risk that the club may be taken away from you and used against you by those you are seeking to threaten with it.

We have got to fight this battle all along the line, and I say to the Senate with all the sincerity I can command that those who are charged with the responsibility of conducting this war, not only on foreign battlefields but on the home front, will not know how to proceed completely and advisedly as long as this problem is suspended in midair and we have not determined it one way or the other.

If the Senate desires to enact this proposed legislation notwithstanding the President's veto, let us vote according to our convictions. If we do not think it ought to be passed over his veto, let us sustain the veto, but do not keep the question suspended in midair so that no one, including the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, including the Economic Stabilizer, including the President of the United States, or anyone else, will know how to proceed on other matters and on other fronts so long as this question is undecided.

For these reasons I hope the Senate will not adopt the motion made by my good friend, the Senator from Alabama. I am sorry he made it. I do not know that he did so with any great enthusiasm.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; to be frank, if I had had the votes, I would not have made the motion; I would have sought a vote immediately on the veto message.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator is frank, as I believe everyone knows he is, in saying that if he had the votes to pass the bill over the veto the motion would not now be pending.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There are too many beguilements.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not intend to go into that. Of course, it is a two-edged sword when it comes to beguilement. So far as I am concerned I do not think any-

body will accuse me of trying to beguile anyone else. I certainly have not been buttonholing Senators all around the Chamber to get them to vote in a certain way. I have not spoken to a single Senator to get him to vote on the question of the veto.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will say to the Senator that so far as I am concerned, I can make the same statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not disputing that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well, but the Senator was looking at me.

Mr. BARKLEY. I like to look at the Senator; he is good looking.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will leave it to every Member of this body, that, so far as I am concerned, I have not approached anyone.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not doubt that. I would not by even looking at the Senator, accuse him of doing so, and I hope he is not offended.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not offended, but I thought there was an implication in the Senator's smile and look.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was making no implication whatever. What I started to say was that I do not believe in legislation by buttonholing; I do not believe in legislation by going in advance to Senators, and, on personal grounds asking them to vote for or against a bill, and I like to think that every other Senator has the same method of approach to the subject that I have. I do not believe in that way of legislation. Sometimes I have been criticized because, in my capacity, I have not made a personal canvass of my colleagues more frequently to induce them to vote in a certain way. I do not believe in that sort of method, and I do not indulge in it. It may be that is one of my shortcomings; but I wish to say to the Senator frankly that if he had the votes to pass the bill over the President's veto he would have driven a hard bargain with us, which he would have had a right to do, and he would have exercised it with his great eloquence and influence. But, so far as I know, without any effort to influence Senators, a sufficient number of them made up their minds to sustain the President's veto. That is the situation. Why seek to put this matter off onto a sidetrack?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will tell the Senator why. It is because I think a great many Senators changed their position as the result of misinformation furnished them, some of it from official sources. I think we have a right to clear it up.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know to what extent the Senator may be correct, because I do not know of any Senator to whom misinformation was furnished.

The only information that has come to us has been in the debates. I suppose we have all asked the departments to give us their figures, whatever they may be, and we have debated them. There cannot be two sets of figures coming from the same department, but we can put our interpretation upon them.

Now that this matter is before us, and the American people want us to act on

it, in order to settle it, I hope the Senate will reject the motion of the Senator from Alabama, and vote on the straight, clear-cut question, whether the President's veto shall be sustained or overridden.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, it seems rather pointless to delay the vote the Senate is about to take, but there are a few things which I feel should be said before the vote is taken.

In the first place, I should prefer to vote on the question of the Presidential veto now. I shall vote for the motion made by the Senator from Alabama, because I deferred to the judgment of some of those who were associated with me in supporting the bill which has been before the Senate. In other words, I should prefer not to defer to the suggestion to refer; but the motion has been made, and I shall support it.

I was rather disturbed at the course of the discussion taken just now by the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and taken last evening by the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. I agree with all these eminent Senators have said, except that I do not agree that there has been a suggestion made on the floor of the Senate that any one of its Members has been, is, or will be influenced by political consideration or partisan consideration in the vote he will cast on this or any other measure. I do not think so meanly of any Member of the United States Senate.

Nor do I think it is well worth our while to advert unnecessarily to the horrible war situation in which we find ourselves, and to suggest that everyone should be willing to make a sacrifice. If there is anyone in the United States of America worthy the name of United States citizen who is not ready to make such a sacrifice, or any sacrifice that is demanded of him, I have not heard from such person, and I pray to Almighty God that I shall not hear from him.

I say that I am ready to vote on the question of the veto now. I am ready to vote to refer it to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I listened to the Senator from North Carolina with the interest and profit which a Member of the Senate may always obtain from an address delivered by him. He is always persuasive, he is always fluent, he is always but little short of convincing, and usually, though not always, he is right. I was particularly interested in the prescription which he wrote for the American people so as to enable them to prevent the horrible advent of inflation. He suggested that they should be ready to accept every sacrifice and that the farmers likewise should be ready to take the same prescription.

Mr. President, I recall incidents of my boyhood, such as all of us have seen over and over again, when the father of the family takes hold of the small boy and drags him in, yelling and kicking, to take a dose of castor oil, and says, "Son, be a man; be a man. Take this. Watch papa. Papa loves it. See, papa likes it." But we never saw papa take it. Papa does not like it, and his pretended sip-

ping is for the purpose of inducing the boy to take the castor oil.

Says the Senator from North Carolina, "The farmers should take this prescription"; and they should. But when he says, "Papa is ready to take it," he falls short of stating what he should have stated on the floor of the Senate.

I picked up this morning's newspaper and saw that railroad profits had increased 800 percent. Therefore, stop the farmer from getting parity.

I saw that stocks had attained the highest level in 3 years, and that there was a transfer of nearly 2,000,000 shares at this high level. Therefore, the farmers should not receive parity.

I saw that the retail stores in the District of Columbia, which support the local newspapers, had during the month of March a 28-percent increase in sales, and that the retail stores of Baltimore had an increase in sales of 61 percent. Therefore do not let the farmers get parity, because it contributes to inflation, it starts the spiral.

I saw Members of the Senate, some of whom have spoken on this floor, vote within the past few days for an increase in the salaries of the Federal employees in the District of Columbia, and other Federal employees, to increase their salaries by \$573,000,000. Therefore do not let the farmers start the spiral of inflation.

I read the message of the President of the United States as of September 7 last, in which he said:

Annual wage and salary disbursements have increased from forty-three and sevenths billion dollars in 1939 to an estimated \$75,000,000,000 in 1942. This represents an increase of 71 percent. To obtain a full appreciation of what that increase means, we should remember that \$75,000,000,000 is more than our total national income was during any single year in the 1930's.

Now listen. I am quoting the President of the United States:

Due to constantly increasing employment, overtime, and wage-rate increases, the annual wage and salary bill for the entire country has been rising by more than a billion dollars a month.

Therefore do not let the farmers' prices go to parity.

Mr. President, I hear and I read that demands are to be made for increases in salaries and in wages in the bituminous-coal industry, in the transportation industry, and in other industries. There may be justification for such increases, but why hang it all on the farmer as the whipping boy? Why brand the farmer with the "scarlet letter" as the one responsible for starting a spiral of inflation, when everywhere throughout the Nation there are not only the signs of an approaching inflation but the knowledge that an inflationary condition is inevitable? That does not mean that we should not impose every restriction and limitation and restraint to lessen the impact of that trend. But let me say, Mr. President, that we cannot take out of the productive effort of this country 11,000,000 persons and put them in uniform and engage them in a destructive effort, we cannot take other millions of persons out of productive industry and place them

in industry which produces munitions to support the 11,000,000 who are engaged in a destructive effort, and not have such a diminution of the supply of the necessities in this country that there will be insistent demand and contest and jealousy for participation in the supply remaining.

When we add to that a purchasing power such as I have suggested we have inflation. When the debt of the United States of America is increased to \$116,000,000,000, and the increase is represented in large measure by bond purchases by commercial institutions, and by purchasing power translated into deposits, how can it be denied that we are not going to have inflation? When everyone sees the specter of inflation coming, it is, to say the least, unfair to say, "Do not let the farmer get parity. Do not let him profiteer."

Mr. President, a committee of the House very recently established that agents of firms selling to the Government in this community and in others had made profits running into the millions of dollars. I heard one representative of a firm testify in the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate that his profits were such that he would have to use a scoopshovel to handle his profits, and from a sense of shame turned some of them back to the United States Government. Shall we, therefore, see to it that the producer of food and fiber will not receive a parity position which we have tried to secure for him for 20 years, and particularly in the last 12 years? The farmer has not asked, and is not asking, for a premium position.

Mr. President, I spoke of what had appeared in the morning newspaper. Let me refer to two other items which appeared in the Washington Post of this morning. The first was a very delightful revelation, I will say to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who referred to the same newspaper yesterday. It was a very delightful revelation, in the form of an editorial, setting forth that the newspaper now takes a position in opposition to parity prices for the farmer's product because it is so deeply interested in the welfare of the farmer. The only thing the newspaper has in mind is that it is not to the farmer's best interest, and it has only the farmer's best interest at heart.

Another matter appears on the same page of that newspaper which is of particular interest to me, and which ought to be of interest to every Member of the United States Senate. It is an article by Mark Sullivan entitled "Bankhead Farm Bill." Mr. Sullivan says in part:

Congress proceeded to undo the President's order, by a bill sponsored by Senator BANKHEAD. The heart of the undoing bill lay in five words: "No deduction shall be made." The purpose was put in words by Democratic Senator McKellar of Tennessee: "The purpose of this bill is to reenact what was enacted in the original bill, but which was misconstrued by the (executive) department."

Now listen, Senators:

In that spirit, the Senate passed the bill by an extraordinary majority, 78 to 2. Because the bill was a reproof to the Presi-

dent for trespassing upon legislative prerogative. Senators voted for it who had no interest in making crop prices high, who indeed wanted crop prices kept low. Senators reflecting the consuming centers of the East voted for the bill. Ardent New Dealers voted for it—WAGNER of New York, GUFFEY of Pennsylvania. The most faithful followers of the administration voted for the bill, including even Senate Leader BARKLEY of Kentucky. In the same spirit, the House passed the bill by 149 to 40.

Mr. President, I resent that attack. I do not believe there is a Member of the United States Senate who voted for that bill as a measure of reproof to the President. I believe that when the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] voted, they voted their convictions.

Mr. SMITH. Why does the Senator put us in that crowd? [Laughter.]

Mr. GILLETTE. I include the Senator from South Carolina because I believe every Member of the Senate votes his honest convictions when the time comes to vote, and I do not believe the Senator from South Carolina or any other Member of the Senate would vote for a measure simply as a reproof.

Mr. President, the suggestion is made that now that we have administered the spanking to the President of the United States we are willing to retreat; that we have picked up a club and taken a crack at him. I did not vote for the bill for that purpose, and I never have in the Senate cast a vote for the purpose of reproving anyone.

The Senator from North Carolina called specific attention, as did the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] today, to the fact that the President of the United States in his message said that he credits the Members of the Senate with sincerity, and I know he does, and that we should also credit him with sincerity, and I know we do.

Why raise the question of sincerity? The Senator from North Carolina—I wish he were present at the moment—was sincere when he voted last January for the Price Control Act which provided that the farmers should receive parity, and that a ceiling should not be placed on anything manufactured in whole or in part from agricultural products which did not reflect parity. The Senator from North Carolina was sincere then. He was sincere when he voted for the bill we passed October 2 last year, which again provided that the farmer shall be entitled to parity, and that no price ceiling shall be placed on anything manufactured in whole or in part from agricultural products which does not reflect parity.

When it became necessary, because of Executive interpretation, again to present a bill, which the Senator from Alabama presented, reaffirming what we had affirmed twice before, the Senator from North Carolina was again sincere, and he voted for it. He now says that, while he voted sincerely three times, he

is going to reverse himself, and I credit him once more with sincerity. I know he is sincerely mistaken. I am not criticizing in any way. I would be the last to criticize any Member of the Senate who reversed himself. Any Member has a right to reverse himself.

I wish now to refer to the matter of veto. Perhaps it is unnecessary, perhaps it is presumptuous for me to speak about it, but I want to do so. I have resented deeply, and have voiced my resentment on the floor of the Senate, the action of the executive department in sending here, while we are considering a measure under our constitutional authority based on the provision of the Constitution that "all legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States," a letter or a message—not a message of the type envisioned by the Constitution, but a letter pertaining to the particular matter inhering—and have it read on the floor of the Senate. I say that such action is an unwarranted interference with the legislative function of the Congress of the United States. I, on this floor, have time and again expressed my disapproval of and my deep concern over any suggestion that one department of the coordinate departments of this Government is interfering with another. I would speak just as vehemently of any attempt on the part of the legislative department to interfere with the rights, functions, duties, and obligations of the executive department. In fact, I have done so. I resented, as did many other Members of the Senate, including the Senator from North Carolina, the attempt, as we saw it, by the executive department to encroach on the functions of the judicial department. I spoke, when I was sitting in the rear row of seats on this side of the Chamber, on what I thought was an attempt by the legislative branch to interfere with the rights of the executive.

After a measure is passed by the Congress, the Executive has the right—not only the right but the duty—to register his approval or disapproval. It may or may not be controlling to me, but I am willing to say that never has a measure for which I voted come back to the Senate with the disapproval of the President, so that I found my judgment challenged, that I did not search my soul to see whether or not I had been mistaken. Oh, the Senator spoke about democratic processes. The veto power in the Constitution of the United States was a compromise, a compromise between the views of those who, like our patron saint on this side of the aisle—Thomas Jefferson—believed that the greatest measure of legislation for the welfare of the entire country could be secured through the clash of opinion in debate by the representatives of the people, and the views of those like James Madison, George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, and James Monroe, who gave voice to the sentiment that the people cannot be trusted. They are too easily swayed by emotions, by prejudices, and are apt to be misled by their prejudices. The welfare of the country could better be served by those who, by experience and education, are better able to judge for

them. I am quoting almost word for word from George Washington, James Madison, and Alexander Hamilton. In deference to their opinion there was placed in the Constitution the veto power, a power which to my knowledge—and perhaps I am making an extravagant statement—has no counterpart in any executive department anywhere else in the world. But we have it in our executive department. What is its effect? Its effect is that when the President returns a measure with his disapproval, majority rule by the representatives of the people is out of the window. No longer do democratic processes and majority rule exist. From that time on, the opinion of the President, sustained conceivably by 17 Members of the Senate—49 being a possible quorum and one-third being 17—can override the registered opinion of both Houses of the Congress. That is according to our Constitution.

Therefore, I believe that any Executive should approach with the utmost care, with the most consummate care, the question of disapproval of a measure passed by the Congress. I have no reason to suppose that that is not done. For the same reason, when an Executive has been impelled to such a decision and to such disapproval because of his deeply held conviction, I, as a Member of the Senate, will give it the most careful and prayerful consideration when it comes here.

If, after such reconsideration, any Member of the Senate finds he was previously mistaken, and therefore changes his viewpoint on a bill, as the majority leader has stated, he should not be criticized. The majority leader said over and over again, "I am not embarrassed." He should not be embarrassed. Neither can anyone accuse him of inconsistency. The decision is one which he must make, and one which he has a right to make.

Now let me refer very briefly to the veto message. I wish once more that the Senator from North Carolina were present. He called attention to some matters in the veto message which he felt reflected great credit on the Chief Executive, and on that point I am in full agreement with him. The Senator from North Carolina is never at a loss to maintain his position. Twice he said, "I will hurriedly go over this portion of the message," and he hurriedly went over it, and I do not blame him for doing so. If I were arguing for the position which he was maintaining, I would go over that part much more speedily than he did.

First, the President, to bolster his position, argues on the historic record as to the definition of "parity." I quote from the veto message:

I further stated—

In the message of September 7, 1942—the purpose should be to hold farm prices at parity, or at levels of a recent date, whichever is higher. * * *

My suggestion regarding the calculation of parity was not novel. It had received the previous approval of the Congress. Under an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (Public Law No. 74, 77th Cong.) the Commodity Credit Corporation was directed—

Now listen—

to make loans on certain 1941 crops at the rate of 85 percent of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year. In approving that act on May 26, 1941, I stated: "I have taken up the construction of the law with certain legislative leaders chiefly responsible for it and have received from them letters stating that for the 1941 crop the broad intention is that parity payments should, if necessary, be so curtailed as to avoid a price above parity if added to the loan and the soil conservation payments.

Not one word about changing the parity-price formula. It is the parity loans or the crop loans and the parity payments which are predicated entirely on a relationship between the market price and the parity price.

Again:

The meaning of "parity" under the original Emergency Price Control Act had been established by administrative interpretation. Furthermore, the Price Administrator's construction had been upheld by the Attorney General prior to the introduction of the act of October 2, 1942.

That is absolutely correct. We wrote into the act, in the most exact words that could be chosen by the drafters of the language, a restatement of the principle that no price ceilings shall be imposed which reflects less than parity under the provisions of the act, or, as the eminent Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] said yesterday, "or otherwise."

In the face of that reaffirmation of our position there came the Executive interpretation, and again we presented a bill saying, "When we said that in October we meant it. If it is necessary to say it again, we will say it again." We said it again in the Senate by a vote of 78 to 2. The House said it again by a vote of 4 to 1; and now the bill is returned with Executive disapproval.

I shall not take the time to discuss all the inaccuracies in the message of the President, but let me call attention to one example:

In the past no one has fought harder than I to help the farmers get parity prices for their crops. With pride I recall that the parity idea was first put into law during my administration.

That is correct.

And by the act of October 2, 1942, the farmers were guaranteed 90 percent of parity prices for all basic crops—

Mr. President, there is not a word in the law to substantiate that statement. Whoever told the President that, or wrote it for him, or induced him to put it in his message, deliberately deceived him. Nowhere in the basic law or in the statute law of the United States is there a guaranty of 90 percent of parity for any crop.

What was probably referred to? Reference was probably made to section 8 (a) of the act of October 2, 1942, which provides as follows:

SEC. 8. (a) The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized and directed to make available upon any crop of the commodities cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts harvested after December 31, 1941, and before the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concur-

rent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated, if producers have not disapproved marketing quotas for such commodity for the marketing year beginning in the calendar year in which such crop is harvested, loans as follows:

(1) To cooperators (except cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn) at the rate of 90 percent of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year;

(2) To cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn, at the rate of 75 percent of the rate specified in (1) above;

(3) To noncooperators (except noncooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn) at the rate of 60 percent of the rate specified in (1) above and only on so much of the commodity as would be subject to penalty if marketed.

That is every word that appears in any law that could be construed as a guaranty of price; and everyone who knows the application of the loan provision knows that its purpose is to bolster price, but it is not a guaranty of price.

What is the commercial corn-producing area? It is a section of the United States in which there is produced on the individual farm more than 450 bushels of corn a year, or, on every acre of tillable land in the country an average of 4 bushels per acre per year. Otherwise farmers cannot participate in the 90-percent loan, or in the benefit payments so far as corn is concerned. They are outside the area.

Time and time again I have discussed on the floor of the Senate the subject of computation of the conservation payments. The farmer who receives a conservation payment has given value received for it, and it has nothing to do with the parity price. He has delivered value received. We said to him, "Take your land out of production and put it into soil-building crops, and comply with our rules and regulations. If you do not raise wheat, corn, or cotton, we will partially compensate you from the United States Treasury." For what? To guarantee him a parity price? No. To compensate him for what he did not raise. He rendered value received. Why should we charge him with it?

A few moments ago the Senator from Kentucky said that we must either add it or deduct it, and that we cannot leave it hanging in midair. Why not? We laid down the formula for computing parity. We said what should be included in it. It is not benefit payments. All that is necessary to do in the application of the Price Control Act is to refer to the parity-price level. Under the terms of that act no ceiling price can be established which does not reflect the parity price. I will say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. SMITH] that that is why I am not supporting the Pace bill. I told him so, and he did not like it. It changes the parity formula, on which we have built a price structure, after the structure has been erected. I will not support it. I told the Senator from South Carolina that I would not speak in favor of it on the floor of the Senate, and I did not. If it comes up again I will speak against it. I am opposed to it.

However, this is a different proposition. The Senator from North Carolina said that the President has asked us to stabilize prices in order to meet the threat of inflation. We must stabilize wages, salaries, and prices of raw materials. The President asked us to do so, and we did so. We did so a year ago last January, and we did so again on October 2, 1942. Let me read the provision to which I refer:

That in order to aid in the effective prosecution of the war the President is authorized and directed, on or before November 1, 1942, to issue a general order stabilizing prices, wages, and salaries, affecting the cost of living; and, except as otherwise provided in this act, such stabilization shall so far as practicable be on the basis of the levels which existed on September 15, 1942.

We clothed the President with plenary authority under that act. The President sent us a message saying, in effect, "If you do not give me the power to stabilize wages, prices, and salaries within such and such a time I will exercise it anyway. I have the right to do so. I believe that under the existing statutes he had a perfect right to do so, but he asked us to give him the power, and we did so. We gave him full and complete power to stabilize wages, prices, and salaries. We laid down two limitations. We said to him, 'You may not fix a price ceiling on articles manufactured in whole or in part from agricultural products which does not reflect parity prices to the farmer, the producer of the raw material.' Then we said, 'Under the authority of this act you may not fix a basis or a ceiling on wages which is inconsistent with the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended.'"

With those limitations we clothed the Chief Executive with absolute power to stabilize. What has been the result? I shall speak frankly, because I believe I know what I am talking about. The determination has been made that farm prices should not be allowed to go to parity. In my judgment, this is in order to lessen the pressure for increased wages. However, the determination has been made that farm prices should not be allowed to go to parity, and that because we are taking away from the farmer that to which he is rightfully entitled under the law, we should supplement the price which the farmer receives by incentive payments from the United States Treasury.

Mr. President, that policy might have been proper if the Congress had desired to follow it, but the Congress refused to do so. It refused by a specific legislative act. Instead, Congress stabilized wages and stabilized prices by using the formula it had prescribed and imposing the restrictions to which I have referred.

Earlier today I read to the Senate some facts which appeared in the newspaper this morning concerning the present rise in the price of stocks, the rise in wages, the rise in retail sales, and all similar inflationary registers. This morning the press carried the news that yesterday on the grain exchange, as well as on the commodity exchange, cotton

broke from 60 cents to \$1 a bale, because of the report that Congress would not override the President's veto. Yesterday, every holder of a pound of cotton lost money at the rate of 60 cents to \$1 a bale, due simply to this threat. Yesterday, every holder of a bushel of wheat lost 2 cents because of this threat. Why? Because, as we have said over and over again, there are no other producers, no other workers, and no other segment of American industry, which cannot take a position and say what it costs them to produce, and what they want for their product, but there are agencies which the farmers cannot control, or have not been able to control, which are preventing their taking the same position. Unfortunate as it may be, when Congress writes specific directives into the law, there are agencies of the Government which find executive interpretation to bypass those directives.

The farmers of the United States ask for no premium position. They want the parity price for every commodity, which was fixed many years ago by a formula, and which we are trying to secure for them. The farmer has no patience with a manipulation which seeks to prevent that result. He is just as patriotic as anyone else; he is willing to make every sacrifice which he is called upon to make; but I submit to any fair-minded person that it is utterly inequitable, and utterly unjust, to hold the farmers responsible every time there is a rise in the cost of living, which may be due to a myriad of factors.

I once read on the floor of the Senate a letter from Secretary Wickard. I had said, "How do you justify the statement that an increase of the kind suggested will result in an increase in the cost of living by a billion and a half dollars?" He answered—and I read it here once before—"It is because of the pyramiding of charges that will be made on distribution, handling, commissions, and retailing costs."

Charge it all to the farmer, when he is asking nothing but the privilege of having the price for his product increased to the point to which the Congress of the United States said it should go.

Mr. President, as I have already said, I am now ready to vote on the question of the veto. In accordance with the policy which I have always had in my own mind, and which I follow in my own office, when the President sent in his veto message I carefully surveyed, to the best of the limited mental powers with which the Almighty has equipped me, the arguments which might sustain the position taken by the President, and I was ready without embarrassment, as the Senator said, to say that I was wrong if I was wrong. I did not find one scintilla of reason, and I have not heard one scintilla of reason presented on the floor of the Senate, for sustaining the veto. There is no reason why I, just as sincerely as the Senator from North Carolina, should not continue to take the position which he took aforesaid and adhere to it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to make the record plain with

respect to my feeling relative to the entire problem which confronts the Senate, and I shall certainly do so in a very brief way.

First, I wish to deal with the Bankhead bill and the veto as the situation confronted us prior to the motion made yesterday by the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. President, I voted for this bill in the first instance because I believed—and I still believe—that it is inherently sound. I believe that the President's Executive order respecting parity for agriculture violated the clear congressional intent. I believed—and I still believe—that it violated equity. I am prepared to reassert this belief through the medium of my vote whenever it can be done to agriculture's advantage. But, Mr. President, I am reluctantly forced to the conclusion that it cannot today be done to agriculture's advantage, nor to the advantage of the country, in the light of the President's veto message, and in the presence of what he says will be his interpretation of a repudiation of his veto, and that is the very fundamental and important thing to consult. Whether we like it or not, the final defense against suicidal inflation in this country is in the hands of the President. Whether we like it or not, we cannot ignore his attitude and his viewpoint in the midst of any crisis related to the war.

When the President puts the Bankhead bill into the status of an inflationary spark plug, virtually asserting that he can no longer attempt to control spiraling wages if the bill passes, I am bound, as a realist, to take official notice of the consequences. I am bound to concede that if he will construe the overriding of his veto as the "go" sign to new wage spirals the net results can be utterly deadly to America—yes, and deadly to agriculture, which will thus lose more in the long run than it can possibly gain in this immediate moment.

The President's interpretation of our action is more important than all the academic logic which can be marshaled in this debate, because his reactions are at the base of the whole situation.

In their statement of April 3 the great farm organizations of the country frankly asserted their belief that—

The amount of money in the Bankhead bill is relatively small.

They deny the mathematics in the Presidential veto and say:

Any increase in the cost of farm commodities which might result from the passage of this measure would be so small as to have little if any effect on the cost of food to the consumer.

If they are right, Mr. President, then the collateral hazard of the passage of this bill over the veto, namely, the Chief Executive's stated belief, however wrong, that its passage will leave him relatively powerless to fight inflation, is calculated to cancel out many times over all possibility of tangible farm advantage from the thing we undertake to do. The hazard lacks any compensation for accepting it, and meanwhile the great common citizenship of America "pays the freight."

Mr. President, I shall never consciously accept any responsibility for the release of the inflationary plague upon our people. There is no current benefit which any group can get from a temporary income advantage which will not be tragically wiped out by the results of a runaway inflation. Therefore, though, in my view, the farmer has not had his relative desserts, and, though I cordially agree with the statement that the farmer "again and again has been unjustly accused of responsibility for inflation," I do not believe we are in a position today where we can serve him with this particular legislation at this particular time when the President frankly asserts that he believes it will, through sheer psychology, if nothing else, leave him powerless to hold the inflationary line.

Unfortunately, the President has the final say in this inflationary affair, and up to now he has been dangerously tolerant of other and far greater inflationary forces. Unfortunately, his attitudes will govern the repercussions to our action. So far as I am concerned, I shall leave the responsibility with him. I shall not rob myself of the right to hold him to strict accountability. I shall provide no alibi for breaking the national defense against inflation anywhere. I shall oppose inflation, whether Presidential or legislative, at any cost, and it will be my profound conviction that I am thus serving the best welfare of every man, woman, and child under the flag.

This brings me, Mr. President, to the pending motion, made by the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] yesterday afternoon, to refer the President's veto message and the bill to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. What I am about to say is unrelated to any eleventh hour parliamentary strategy in respect to the disposition of the pending question. It is what I was prepared to say when this debate opened. I think it would be most unfortunate if the veto message should be submitted to a vote today. I prefer to send the message to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry there to await conclusive Presidential action in respect to his responsibilities regarding inflation on the labor front. If he performs pursuant to the spirit of his courageous message, then our duty to hold the line becomes crystal clear beyond the possibility of argument. If he does not perform there will be an obvious need to establish a new equilibrium. It will be up to him.

The stabilization problem is not quite so clear as it was stated yesterday in the eloquent address of the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. It is not solely in congressional keeping. On the contrary, the President plays a major role in it. With great respect, I assert that too frequently in the past he has been too hesitant to accept this role. By holding in abeyance action upon his veto, it is my opinion we can actually strengthen his hand and encourage his purpose in respect to the inflationary influences over which he exclusively presides. Action on the veto message ought to wait until the President himself

demonstrates, at long last, that we are consistently to have high, effective leadership against inflation not only on the farm front but on other fronts where the President and his associated executives clearly are supreme. The veto message should be referred to the committee pending these developments because no one phase of this inflationary pattern can any longer be segregated from all other phases. If there is to be an ultimatum the ultimatum should go from us to the President as well as come from the President to us.

I am sorry, Mr. President, to hear the distinguished and able majority leader suggest that some support for the motion of the able Senator from Alabama might flow from a desire or a willingness on the part of some Senators to avoid what he calls an embarrassing vote. I do not conceive that any Senator is seeking a cyclone cellar in the presence of this challenge, but lest there be any doubt on the subject so far as I am concerned, I conclude my remarks, after again asserting my belief that there is logic and advantage to the country in referring the Bankhead bill and the veto message to the committee, by saying, so that neither the Senator from Kentucky nor anyone else may accuse me of seeking to hide from this challenge, that beyond any question of a doubt if this prudent and practical course is barred to us and if we must now vote the Presidential veto up or down, I shall vote to sustain the veto, because I shall not be in anywise a party to giving the President a reason or an excuse for surrendering to the forces of inflation on any front, and rightly or wrongly, that is the essence of his veto ultimatum.

Mr. President, in my humble judgment, we have reached a point where one spark can ignite a powder train. The veto message is the powder train, and I decline to apply the spark; I decline to give anybody in this Government an excuse to let the spark be applied. The resultant conflagration could sadly burn us all. Agriculture will not be warmed by such fires; it will be consumed; and so will labor, and so will America. The President and the Congress must hold these lines together. I hope I am prepared to do my part.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I rise for two purposes, and before I take my seat I expect to have accomplished both. The first purpose is to state my stand in regard to the veto message, and to give my reasons for being ready to vote to override the President's veto. The second part of my remarks, very closely related to the first part in logic, will deal with the opening of the Jeffersonian Bicentennial Celebration.

Mr. President, much has been said lately about history, about the teaching of history, and about speaking from history.

What I shall say today will be from history, and one who has had experience in talking from history knows that one does not keep audiences long when he becomes historical. It is when he becomes hysterical that audiences like to hear him, and those of us who imagine that newspapers, orators, and people in the world generally, would be satisfied with history,

make the mistake of all time. But since I am talking only to justify my own stand, I hope to stay with history, though none listen to me.

In regard to the veto message, I shall not add much to what has already been said, but I wish to say, speaking historically, that the message does talk loosely about inflation. I have been close to stabilization in France, I was close to inflation in Germany, I know the reason for the inflationary period in Russia, and I wish to say—and I believe history will bear me out—that if we are talking about a rise in prices, that is one thing, but there has never been in modern times, in any nation in the world where inflation has been started, an instance where it has not been started by government act, to accomplish a governmental purpose. To imagine that we grow into these things is the most fallacious notion imaginable.

One more point about inflation, a point which is completely lost sight of in the argument in regard to the pending veto message and the bill which has been vetoed, is that inflation never occurs if there is an increase in production, and if there are plenty of things to buy. The way to stop inflation is to have an abundance of goods.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I think there should be a quorum present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Alabama for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; I am talking history, and no one would be interested.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator can- ested.

not be sure about that; I am interested.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The fact is that if, by satisfying what has been a natural demand of the farmers for what they think in justice is due them, we bring about an increase of farm products by just a few percent, we then bring about a condition which will do more than any other single thing to overcome inflation, as the inflation is related to food products, and other products which come from the farm. That is not theory; that is fact.

There is discussion of the inflation theories as they were reported in the President's message. The logic of the message is based upon the notion that we had established in our country a freezing, so far as price fixing was concerned. That was not the case. We did just the opposite. It was suggested that we should freeze everything, prices, wages, and everything else, during the duration, but we turned our backs upon that when we dealt with the bill bringing into existence price control.

There was afforded in that bill, and there will always be afforded in any kind of a similar bill, if we are to be just, a proper chance to get rid of the inequities, injustices, and freezing proposals which are so deadly to man wherever we find him.

Mr. President, the evil of the veto message—and it is an evil—was emphasized by the previous speaker, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. He is

going to cast an "expedient" vote because the President of the United States tells him that if he, the President, does not have control of agricultural prices, he will lose control of something else. That is a type of appeal we should not hear at this time. Our actions should be based upon justice, upon right, not upon expediency.

If, for example, the miners, through negotiations, through arbitration, prove their point in regard to an increase in wages, they should have the increase, and they should not be denied merely because it might affect a farmer somewhere, and upset what someone imagines is the equilibrium. There is no equilibrium. Anyone who knows anything about the economy of the United States knows that there is not an equilibrium. We established our price-control system and our wage control so that injustices and inequities might be ironed out by negotiation, and, if I remember my feeling when I voted for the bill which has now been vetoed, it was that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry had done a good job in attempting to overcome an inequity, in attempting to bring about justice where justice should be brought about, and in attempting to give the farmers a chance to have something to which they were entitled.

I do not believe enactment of the bill would have brought bliss and happiness, but it would have been an encouragement, and there would have come, and there will come, if it shall become law, an increase in farm activities, and, as I said before, an abundance of production is the greatest deterrent to inflation that can be brought into existence in this country, so far as food prices are concerned.

Let us be just to those to whom justice is due. In times such as these we should throw expediency out the window. Why should we want to be harsh to one group of our citizens because it may be thought that if we are harsh to them we can be harsh to another group? Why is it that we always come to these expedient reasons about curbing the farmer, about curbing the wage earner, when they are the persons most affected? We know there has always been a struggle to attempt to take care of the under dog. We know that we have never gotten away from that struggle.

The appeals which are made for the under dog are always the same. Who in America wishes to be unjust to labor or to the farmer? No one when he speaks so he can be heard, utters such sentiments. But when an effort is made to help the under dog we find all the trouble in the world.

Mr. President, no one in the whole country is more interested than I in seeing brought to a successful conclusion the attempt toward wage stabilization which came into existence as the result of my own motion made in the industry-labor conference to do away with strikes and with lock-outs. No one is more interested than I in having all disputes between industry and labor settled by peaceful means. I should like to see disputes settled in that way. That is the American way. I should like to see such

a result brought about, not only for the good of the laboring man but for the welfare of the women and children and others who are dependent upon him.

Let us stay with history in these matters. Let us not follow theory. Those of us who have been trained in scientific methods know that it is very well to theorize, but we do not dogmatize when we get into the realm of theory. When we argue we argue on the basis of fact.

Mr. President, I wish to make one more statement. We are spending billions upon billions of dollars today in connection with the war. Do you not think, Mr. President, that spending has something to do with the inflationary trend? No one mentions that fact, but some persons seem to believe that it would be a terrible mistake to give the farmer a half cent more for his wheat or for his corn, and that it would be inflationary. Yet we have appropriated in one Army bill \$50,000,000,000, and we did so without winking an eye.

It is spending which causes inflation, and we must spend because we are in the war. Let us be historical about the matter and let us also be logical. The time may come when we shall be as deeply in debt as Germany was. Pray God that time may never come. If we provide proper controls, I think the time will never come because our wealth is so great that it need not come.

Mr. President, there are, however, in our country conditions which are extremely wasteful. When out of 600 men called to the colors in a given State 135 are rejected because they cannot read and write sufficiently to take their places in the armed forces of the United States, we have an economic waste which is so costly and so deadly that it ought to attract the attention of us all. More than 800,000 boys have been rejected by the Army of the United States because they could not read and write sufficiently to take the simple orders required of a private in the Army of the United States.

Mr. President, let us go back to history again. In all the history of wars and battles there is not a single battle the issue of which could not have been changed by 800,000 more men. Fifteen or 16 divisions would have changed the issue of any battle of any consequence which has been fought in all the history of the world. Yet some may say, "We do not want to teach those rejected boys to read and write."

The way to overcome inflation is to see to it that production continues in a normal way. If we are afraid of inflation, let us stimulate production and do what we can to see that there is greater production; then there will not be inflation. The proposed legislation had exactly that tendency. Let us not be against something because we think a certain laboring man somewhere will receive in wages a few dollars more than we may think he is entitled to. Let us be fair in this matter. Let us judge the question on its merits.

Mr. President, I wish to say one more word about the veto of the measure, because the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRILLETT] caused my mind to turn again to history when he mentioned the veto. He

made the statement that the provision with respect to veto in the American Constitution is a rather unique thing in government. He said it was not spoken of by the fathers as a veto, but was spoken of as an objection. Finally the idea was adopted and became the law. But George Washington, who was quite close to the founding fathers, assumed that the only right of veto he had was to veto an act which he thought was unconstitutional. He assumed he had the power to bring about a reconsideration of a congressional act which was outside the bounds set by the Constitution.

There is no question concerning the constitutionality of the bill which has been vetoed. Presidents of the United States since Washington's time have gotten away from the original theory of the veto. A hundred years ago, back in the 1840's, great debates concerning the President's veto power took place in the House of Representatives, and in the course of those debates there was delivered one of the greatest speeches ever made in Congress, a speech which, describing the power of the President with respect to the veto, held that the President can suggest, he can do this and that, but he cannot say "Thou shalt not." I do not suppose our present President is trying to say, "Thou shalt not," but, especially since the days of Grover Cleveland, the power of the veto has become more or less of a personal thing.

Mr. President, we ought to study this subject. We ought to realize the tendencies which prevail. The present President of the United States twice vetoed a small bill. The second time it was passed by both Houses of Congress by unanimous vote. The power to override a veto resides in merely a two-thirds vote of the Congress.

Much discussion is taking place with respect to government by law as against government by decree. I do not accept the thesis of the Senators on the other side with respect to the veto, but I do say, since we are talking about a new world, since we are talking about the extension of democracy since we know that from our own experience will come practically every idea that will be of worth for the new world, that it is time for us to be thoughtful concerning our own constitutional provisions, and attempt to understand them. I should like to see one constitutional provision reopened, discussed, and reevaluated, namely the power of the President to veto—when he should and when he should not veto. The will of the people of the United States is expressed in their Congress. The last word resides in the Congress. Democracy will die, representative government will cease to exist, when the right to have the last word no longer resides in Congress.

THOMAS JEFFERSON BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Mr. President, when I rose to speak I warned the Senate that I was going to be historical. I warned the Senate that I was going to talk in an academic way, and I warned Senators that if they remained in the Senate they would have to listen to a word or two which would open up what I hope will be the most magnificent year in American history,

the year of the celebration of the birth of one of the great founding fathers, Thomas Jefferson.

We are just a few days away from a celebration of uncommon interest. Let me say that I am making these remarks by request. What has been prepared for delivery at this point has been prepared because I have been asked to do so. On next Tuesday, April 13, the Jefferson Memorial will be dedicated, and a year of celebration will be started. The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission has representatives in this body. Both the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] and I are vice chairmen of the Commission; and the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is the other Member of the Senate who is a member of the Commission. We are proud of what we have been able to accomplish. We are proud of the monument. We are proud to be able, at a time when the world needs it so much, to present to the world an evaluation of our great Jefferson. We trust that what will be said during the year will contribute to the coming of the new world which he tried so hard to bring into existence.

Let me suggest even to the Members of this august body that the next time they get a \$1 silver certificate they turn it over and look at the reverse of the seal of the United States and refer to the Latin and get the spirit of the founding fathers, the spirit of Jefferson, and understand what they were trying to do, and perhaps even go so far as to interpret in some little way some of the remarks I have made today. Let me suggest that they study the words printed on the reverse of the certificate—the motto in which all of us should be interested: "Annuit coeptis novus ordo seclorum," or, in the English, "God bless our undertakings, God bless our beginnings, in this new order in the earth." That is the way to look at Jefferson, and that is the way to look toward the problems which we have facing us from time to time.

I am not afraid of American history. I hope and trust that the appeal being made for a more thorough study of American history will succeed.

Let me tell the Senate one thing about the Jefferson Monument, which is unique in the field of art. The design is old; the monument is a copy of what was Jefferson's favorite building in the world, a copy of the rotunda of the Pantheon at Rome. The architects of the monument, like all architects, of course, made suggestions for the pediment. They proposed for the pediment the figure of an eagle, or the figure of a goddess, or the fascist sign, or other symbols. I objected to the symbolic representation of anything in American history, when history is better than symbol. After 3 years of struggle the Commission let us have history depicted in the pediment. Every boy and girl who goes to see the monument will look up at it, and say, "Who are those men?" The five men shown there are the five members of the Continental Congress appointed as a committee to draft the Declaration of Independence. The effort was not an individual one; there were five men. Con-

gress was functioning, and a committee was appointed. The members of the committee were not unanimous in their report; there was a minority report. Who are the five men? The committee was national in its make-up: Jefferson, of course, who was the chairman; Franklin, from Pennsylvania; Roger Sherman, from Connecticut; John Adams, from Massachusetts; and President Livingston, of Kings College, from New York. I will not say who was the one who dissented from the majority report; on that score I refer the Senate to history. However, Mr. President, let me say that there was not the wonderful unanimity of opinion which we always associate with the proceedings of that time. Those men were doing what we of today are doing.

When the question of the annexation of Louisiana was put to the Senate, believe it or not, there were seven Senators who actually voted against it. We can feel all right about being "out of harmony" with things. We are consistent with the past. But, Mr. President, may it never be said of one of us here that we would ever have cast our vote against the Louisiana Purchase, for example, or some enterprise equally important. Things just as important are looming on the horizon.

Mr. President, on April 13, President Roosevelt will represent the Nation in paying homage to the memory of Thomas Jefferson. The bicentennial ceremony and the new memorial building are the outward signs of America's tribute to one of its greatest founding fathers. As we know, the Jefferson Bicentennial Commission has planned for more than that. It has had the entire year designated as Jefferson's year, in the hope that there will be deeper interest in the meaning of Jeffersonian philosophy than ever before. Those who venerate Jefferson, as I do, are hoping that the people will someday realize why this man, who had nothing of the demagog in him, was a supreme advocate of the people's cause. When we, as a Nation, become aware of the full significance of the Jefferson Memorial, forming the third and last principal memorial in our Capital City, when we understand Jefferson's place in the triad of our American great—Washington, Lincoln, and now Jefferson—our conception of democracy will be richer than ever before.

By strange coincidence, Jefferson's fight against bigotry and oppression is the same fight in which we are now engaged. His enemies were different men, of course. But they were, after all, only incidents in the spiritual battle which Jefferson waged. He called them "Monarchomen" at home; he called them Caesars or Bonapartes abroad. Jefferson's habit was to take issue with tyrants wherever they were, whenever he could. That spirit behind Jefferson's fight is our own spirit. Where ours is sometimes confused, and inclined to stop short of necessary consequences, his was firm. Once having seen an issue of principle, Jefferson hardened like steel, and stood ready to make his fight complete.

The spirit of Jefferson's fight is hard to define, although in some mysterious

way it has already become part of our heritage. It borrows something from the ancient stoic "cosmopolitan citizen." It partakes of the liberties of Anglo-Saxon law. It is suffused by the egalitarianism of the French Revolution. It is the very language of the enlightenment, but tempered, made into native idiom suited to our American sense of realism and practicality. It is a spirit of revolt against those who would "draw the cords of power as tight as they could" around the necks of their victims. That spirit of freedom and justice, working in one's own home or in action far afield against the Barbary pirates of every age, is instinct with a mighty truth. Jefferson called it a palpable truth. He phrased it like this:

That the mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few boot and spurred, ready to ride them legitimately by the grace of God.

This truth, I think, is the keynote to Jefferson's political testament. Is it not also the conviction of all Democrats today? This is the moral of democracy's warfare against the Axis Powers, who have amply shown their boots and spurs. They dare not claim them by the grace of God.

It would not be right, however, to remember only the persons and issues which Jefferson opposed. He was virtually driven into fighting by stubborn evils around him; but he was a complex man, and possessed the gentlest of natures. He was attached to everything good and with a devotion amounting to natural piety. No figure on the American historical scene has had a more genuine understanding of moral values. Morality was the heart of human life for Jefferson. Moral manners had a chance for perfection provided society did not become obtrusive. If things had turned out as Jefferson wished, we should be living in a world where neighbors were bound in affection and common work to neighbors; wards to wards; counties to counties; States to States; nations to nations; and the "family of nations" would then be the last triumph of harmony and reason in worldly affairs. The morality of man would be a pattern for government; the morality of governments a test and proof of the morality of man.

Clearly Jefferson's vision was a vision of peace. "Peace is my passion," he had avowed. He would have liked to take his peace quietly, in the privacy he coveted. But the simple mode of life for which Jefferson yearned—his family, farm, and books—was seldom his lot. The difficulties of public service and the burdens of leadership filled his life with a thousand complications. He sometimes rebelled against ties which bound him, but passing moods never made him forget his mission. Peace was the basic value. It was the ground in which all virtue, all happiness, all civilization was rooted. No role a man might choose could be more freighted with personal trouble and mistrust than this one was, and none in Jefferson's Christian scheme of values could be more worthy.

The embargo should be seen as only one detail, one device in this strategy of peace. It brought a climax of scorpion abuse upon the head of the 65-year-old President. But Jefferson was used to abuse and ready to pay for his "passion for peace." There are times, however, when barbarism is afoot in the world and the passion for peace is powerless before it. The experiment of the embargo having failed, Jefferson concluded sadly, "the nineteenth century dawns with the vandalism of the fifth."

Despite these extraordinary proofs of Jefferson's service in the cause of peace, he was never once in his career associated with the disgraceful banner of "peace at any price." He had known, ever since the days preceding the Declaration of Independence, that some wars were justified in the sight of God and mankind. Where the issue is self-preservation, where the issue is the freedom and responsibility of men, there is no choice but fight to the death. The aged statesman's defense of the French Revolution, many years after the event, still has a formidable sound. He stated solemnly:

Rather than it should have failed I would have seen half the earth desolated; were there but an Adam and Eve left in every country, and left free, it would be better than as it now is.

Let us remember, too, that the man who justified the sacrifices for peace was unrelenting about the sacrifices necessary for defending freedom. He spoke of the heavy price paid for instituting representative government in some countries, and instead of lamenting the cost, urged that free government be spread throughout the world. Listen to his words and see how prophetic they are:

To attain this * * * rivers of blood must yet flow, and years of desolation pass over; yet the object is worth rivers of blood, and years of desolation. For what inheritance so valuable, can man leave to his posterity?

What is the object like, which Jefferson considered worth rivers of blood? It is nothing less than the preservation of good will; keeping open the channels of liberty, opportunity, education, and progress. But the object has two sides: at home, and abroad. At home, the object is harmony, order, protected civil rights, truth, government by the elected representatives of the people. Abroad, the object is peace, cooperation, a pattern of decent dealings between nations, justice.

When Jefferson came to the logical conclusion of his belief in the value of each individual person, he saw revealed the principle of federation. Federation had integrated America. We had applied it more widely than Europe at that time, and perhaps most widely in all the world for peaceful purposes. An Albemarle County farmer, for example, was not only a member of his county, and a native Virginian, but equally a citizen of the United American States. The associated States became the Nation. The dynamic push of this princi-

ple is inescapable: it ends in the federation of the sovereign states of the world. Just as membership in your county is perfectly compatible with membership in your State, so citizenship in one country implies no conflict with citizenship in the international community.

History records the care with which Jefferson tried a policy of isolation for his country. He learned so handsomely from his mistakes, however, that one wonders why the world has not learned with him. He saw that the health of Virginia farmers and Massachusetts merchants was an intricate function of the prosperity of other civilized nations. In his plain way he put the theory of interdependence on the agenda for political thinkers, by saying:

Could every country be employed in producing that which nature has best fitted it to produce, and each be free to exchange with others mutual surpluses for mutual wants, the greatest mass possible would then be produced of those things which contribute to human life and human happiness; the number of mankind would be increased, and their condition bettered.

Jefferson said this of commerce and physical welfare. We are all familiar with the eloquence he brought to this theme as it involved the progress of knowledge and the arts of civilization.

In this war America stands beside the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and workers of the United Nations, to annihilate the most dangerous barbarism in all history. Jefferson's deep faith in our destiny should light our path and lighten our task. What he imagined as a possible cosmic union of the future, the blood and mire of the battlefield has almost forced into existence. Now we know only too well that the power, health, and intelligence of our British, Chinese, and Russian allies are a vital concern to us. The foundation for a Federation of Nations is already here. There is now a real chance for banding together one day on a world-wide scale. When we do so we may achieve exactly what banding together did for some straggling colonies along the eastern seaboard of North America in the days when Tom Jefferson was a young man.

Jefferson claimed that honest men could make no compromise between systems based on force and those based upon the will of the majority. That was a profound perception. There can never be good will and abundant opportunity at home when there is slavery, famine, and forced labor abroad. When men have been reduced to servitude, lacking will and soul, lacking even the capacities to act in their own behalf, they have been pushed alive into the land of the shades. They have been cheated of the functions of the living. Jefferson raised a great line of thought when he wrote, from Paris, asking "whether one generation of men has a right to bind another?" He knew the answer, and gave it quickly: "The earth belongs in usufruct to the living." The land belongs to the living for them to use. When the men in a land are slaves, the land is not theirs. One reason we must fight this war

through is to stop this violation of the prime social right.

Jefferson often stated that there was but one code of morality for men and for the family of nations. The land belongs to the living within a nation, and only a peaceful family of nations can tend this right. Take the solid basis of the right to work, to earn sufficiency, to security, which is implied in the land to the living theory. Combine it with the federated family of nations ideal. Together you have the spearhead of Jeffersonian vision for us today.

It will be our job, in cooperation with our mature and experienced allies, to recruit more and more land for the living after this war. We shall need strength, singly and together, to resist temptation first. None of us can afford to acquire territory for permanent empire; it is not practical and it is beyond the pale of morality. The Far East, with its subject millions, must come into its own—but justly—on the principle of majority rule, reason, order. The torn countries of Europe, the desolated places of Africa must be healed and helped on the road to political convalescence. If it takes provisional mandates to do this, or any other constructive control, the United Nations must be willing to see it through. A federated union of democracies cannot be forged without titanic work and inspired plan. In time even the enemy lands must, for selfish reasons, if no other, be put within the great circle of free society.

These are some reasons why we indeed have occasion to remember Thomas Jefferson in the midst of our trials. Unique American statesman that he was, his citizenship in the world brought us its true riches—wisdom, invention, purity of heart. The day we mark his two-hundredth birthday is an important day. The day America lives in the recognition of his spirit and labors in the service of his ideals is a day of hope for the society of men.

Mr. President, on Sunday last I delivered an address to a group of people in Carnegie Hall, New York City, who believed that something should be said in an attempt to overcome the propaganda of the Axis Powers in trying to divide the members of the allied group. I closed that address with a poem written in a far-off land, but which breathes so completely the spirit of America, and the spirit of Jefferson, that I cannot refrain from reading it here and using it as the closing of my remarks. The poem is as follows:

"Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high;
Where knowledge is free;
Where the world has not been broken up into fragments by narrow domestic walls;
Where words come out from the depth of truth;
Where tireless striving stretches its arms toward perfection;
Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way into the dreary desert sand of dead habit;
Where the mind is led forward by Thee into ever-widening thought and action—
Into that heaven of freedom, my Father, let my country awake."

PREVENTION OF DEDUCTIONS IN DETERMINING PARITY OR COMPARABLE PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—VETO

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (S. 660) to prevent certain deductions in determining parity or comparable prices of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] to refer the pending bill (S. 660), with the accompanying message, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I do not intend to discuss the merits of the pending measure again today, beyond reiterating my support of the Bankhead bill; but ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the following telegram which I have just received from Dr. C. O. Wolf, of Ottawa, Kans., President of the Kansas State Farm Bureau.

There being no objection the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

MANHATTAN, KANS., April 6, 1943.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER:

Kansas Farm Bureau Board of Directors in session today urgently recommend passage of Bankhead bill notwithstanding veto of President.

O. O. WOLF, President.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I can assure the Senate that this message from the Kansas Farm Bureau represents the views of the majority of Kansas farmers, and I believe of the majority of the people of Kansas.

I believe that the purpose and effect of the Bankhead bill have been misunderstood and even misrepresented. The measure does not propose to increase the parity price on any farm commodity. It only prohibits the executive branch of the Government from lowering parity prices below the parity established through laws already passed by Congress and approved by the President. I look forward to the ultimate passage of the bill, notwithstanding the veto of the President.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I desire to occupy the floor for a brief period of time for the purpose of making some observations on the matter under discussion. I do so because reference has been made to the historical significance of the discussion on price legislation in this body during the past 2 or 3 days.

The historian of the future will write the story of this period in the light of our legislative activities. He will find significance in the remarks of the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and the remarks of the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], because they are a part of history in the making.

The Senator from Iowa called attention to the criticism by certain newspapers of the efforts of farmers to achieve a return on their efforts in the form of recoupment for wages paid. I recall, for the purpose of the record, that one of those newspapers recently carried on its front page a statement that it was raising its rates to subscribers so as to make

up for added costs of production, which, of course, include all labor costs. Historians of this period may ask why the Senate questioned the right of farmers, for instance, to recoup themselves for wages paid.

The price control law of January 30, 1942, was our first real effort at control of general prices. An amendment, called the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, contained a provision that it was not to be construed to authorize the regulation of rates charged by any public utility, or rates charged by any person in the business of operating or publishing a newspaper.

So as we debate the question of price control, we face the fact that two major enterprises in the United States, the press of America and the public utilities, came to Congress, as interested groups, and secured exemption from price control. I am not indicting anyone; I am merely reciting history. If anyone believes that I am misstating the facts I hope he will rise at this moment, and I will gladly yield the floor for a correction.

I repeat that I am merely reciting legislative history in saying that these two groups, representing probably one of the largest aggregations of capital investment in the United States, came to Congress and sought and received special consideration in that they were not brought under the Price Control Act. We refrained from any attempt to prevent them from raising their rates and charges for services rendered and products sold. I do not believe that any Member of this body will disagree with that statement because we are all fully aware of it being done by consent of the Senate and House.

A somewhat belated effort was made to backtrack on the first 1942 provision of the law, by an act which was passed and approved on October 2, 1942. In that second act the Congress, including our own body, said that no public utility could generally raise its rates, without 30 days' notice to the President. It would require a wizard of words to find much real authority to control utility rates in this ladylike language.

In the bill of October 2, 1942, to which I have referred, will be found the following language:

No . . . public utility shall make any general increase in its rates or charges which were in effect on September 15, 1942, unless it first gives 30 days' notice to the President.

How gentle we were. We merely required them to give notice that they were going to raise their rates.

The Senator from Michigan who is a very able gentleman with a fine mind, said this morning that he would not take upon his shoulders any shred of moral responsibility for supporting any step which might be inflationary, and that he would join in fighting anything of that character.

I understand his viewpoint. I am not making an argument at the moment, I am merely trying to read into the RECORD a little history which will be examined by students of the future who will try to understand our legislative actions. Raising utility rates would certainly add to

the cost of living of all of us. I know my friend from Michigan would agree with this conclusion.

The President, acting under the act of October 1942, sent representatives of the O. P. A., one of his agencies, before a public-service commission in the District of Columbia to protest a rate increase by the Potomac Electric Power Co. Their argument was that a rate raise would be inflationary because it added to the general cost of living. If one pays 5 cents a kilowatt-hour for electric energy in his home instead of 3½ cents, that increases his cost of living precisely as paying 5 cents for a loaf of bread instead of 3½ cents increases the cost of living. I know there are gentlemen who may not be able to bring themselves into agreement with that obvious truth, but it is a truth.

I am going to discuss a little later on this floor the position of the utilities in this matter of increases to pass along to consumers the added cost of war. It ought to be interesting to us because we are discussing the very fundamental and identical principle of a producer of another vital commodity passing along the cost of production of it to the public. The position of the Potomac Electric Power Co., in common with the position of other utilities concerning which we legislate, was that it had a right to pass along to the consuming public every single penny of its cost of operation, every conceivable form of operating overhead expense, including every penny of the taxes it paid to every public body, including the United States Government and including, of course, war taxes. Under such an agreeable arrangement, the company, as a corporate enterprise, would not pay one penny of tax. Consumers would bear the entire burden. The Treasury Department will probably be generous in the allowance of advertising costs as an operating overhead expense. So the company, in due time, will regale and titillate the Senate and the general public, with full page ads pointing out how much it has contributed to the war effort by the huge tax bills it pays, and that out of these taxes we are buying tanks and airplanes and guns for the courageous lads in Africa and in the Southwest Pacific. The ad will in no wise be frank in making it known that the light users, including Members of the Senate who have apartments, pay in their light bills all the taxes which the company says it pays.

The legal truth wrapped up in this statement is that the company by law wants to pass to the consuming public, every penny of its operating costs, including every penny of its taxes. Every lawyer in this body knows that to be true. That is not an argument; it is a statement of fact. I do not want to labor the point, but that principle is firmly grounded in all regulatory laws affecting power utilities.

The company naturally argues that: "We cannot operate unless we are able to do that. That principle has been sanctified by State legislation, by regulatory bodies in every State in the Union which has regulatory laws; it has been sanctified by decrees of courts in every

State where such laws are on the books. That principle has been sanctified by decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and historically it is an established principle of law."

I have not seen it assailed in this body; on the contrary, this body has, so far as it has passed judgment on it, ratified, confirmed, approved, and given its blessing to the principle. That is one reason why I am somewhat more understanding and tolerant toward the demands of workers and farmers for a sufficient amount of return to operate a farm or maintain their bodies in sound health. If it be a farmer operating his farm, or on the basis of human efficiency, if it be a worker working in a factory for wages, I want to see him get enough in the way of return to sustain his body, which is his invested capital. In a worldly sense all he has is his body; and he must get enough wages to keep his body in good operating condition, exactly as a utility of any kind must get enough out of the public to keep the utility property in good operating condition.

A utility goes even a step further in that it may lawfully collect in rates and lay aside funds for depreciation, so that when the winds and the rains and the sleet and ice wear out the system, the company has collected from the consumers enough to reproduce its property for the private owners. We make no such careful provision for the average worker, unless it be that by workmen's compensation acts we give him something for his broken and battered body, or set up a limited retirement system, which is a sort of effort to achieve the same thing as a depreciation fund. I want to comment later on this question, when the Potomac Electric Power Co. controversy is settled, for it has great significance. It is going to be a very interesting story, both to the workers and the farmers, and I hope that I shall be able to enshrine it in the Record in such fashion that it will be thoroughly understood by those interested in the various phases of price control.

I am wondering now what reception Congress might give the kind of a formula I am about to describe if it were applied to farm production in the United States. Suppose, as Members of the Senate, we were called upon to vote upon it. What would our attitude be? In order that Senators may contemplate this hypothetical principle at close range, I shall read into the Record a supposititious bill and assume that the Senate was to consider and to vote on it. Suppose we were asked by the so-called farm bloc to vote for such a principle. In reading this imaginary farm bill, I want to call attention to the fact that billions upon billions of dollars of business property come under this very price formula.

Captious critics of this theory would raise one objection; they would say the mechanics of enforcement would probably be too difficult. I want to say that we need not pass judgment on the mechanics of enforcement, because Congress would never pass such legislation, and it would be a work of supererogation to

criticize it on that basis. All that need be done is to contemplate the principle of establishing prices to the public now approved for selected utility groups. If they oppose workers getting enough to take care of themselves decently, to keep their family life on a normal, decent basis, or the farmer getting enough to keep his farm going, how can they justify recapturing from the public all their costs of every kind, including all their taxes.

Read this imaginary law for farmers and recall that private power utilities have all that this formula suggests: "No maximum price shall be established or maintained under authority of this act or otherwise for any agricultural commodity, or for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity below a price which will provide for the producers of the agricultural commodity a fair return for such commodity and for the property utilized in its production. For the purpose of determining a fair return for such commodity and such property, consideration shall be given to the elements and factors ordinarily taken into consideration in determining the earnings and regulating the rates of public utilities, and such fair return shall be fixed on a basis which is as nearly similar as is possible to the basis ordinarily used by regulatory bodies for fixing the rates which may be charged by public utilities."

I know that no such principle of law would ever be adopted, and yet, Mr. President and Senators, workers and farmers are certainly entitled to as much as we grant to private utilities.

The special privilege of passing along to the public all costs and all taxes and then capturing nice profits for owners affects the largest mass of business property in our business life.

Later I wish to discuss the record of the Potomac Electric Power Co. in relation to this matter, and point out that its president, in testimony a short time ago, announced that the company claimed the legal right to write into electric bills of the District of Columbia every penny of all its operating costs, including every penny of its Federal and local taxes. No wonder Uncle Sam is interested. He is paying in his own light bills the very taxes the company will hand back to him with the proud boast that it is helping with the war effort. It is a wonderful spectacle.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to speak only 4 or 5 minutes on the motion to refer.

The charge has often been made, when we have been considering agricultural bills, that the Senators from the South are interested only in cotton. Time and time again in the great Northwest I have heard the statement that the Senators from the Northwest should watch the Senators from the South, because they were primarily interested only in cotton.

As I view the situation, Mr. President, the great thing about the debate on the Bankhead bill has not been the President's veto, it has not been, as Mark

Sullivan said, the question of the sincerity of the President, but it has been the fine attitude of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], who have led the fight for the bill, when cotton was not concerned at all, when at the most only corn—and wheat, to a very slight extent—were concerned.

The debate is significant for another reason. For the first time since I came to the Senate I find that all five major farm organizations are solidly behind one measure. So far as I know, that has never happened before. We have here the Farmer's Union, the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, every one in favor of the Bankhead bill, and while the Farmer's Union has not said where it stands so far as the veto is concerned, the other four have, and the Farmer's Union not having sent word to the contrary, we can assume that they have joined the other four major farm organizations.

Who is fighting this measure? We find the American Federation of Labor and the C. I. O. against it. The only representatives of those organizations who have come to see me, the only ones who, as the distinguished majority leader put it, were out buttonholing people, were the head of the C. I. O. here in the city of Washington and some of the leaders of the American Federation of Labor.

I ask Senators who are in favor of the farmers, who was it who led the fight against the farmers a few years ago, when the farmers had a chance to get money during the drought at 1½ percent interest and save their homes? It was the same William Green who is still head of the American Federation of Labor, who wrote a letter to every Senator who was in Washington at that time saying that the farmer should not get money at 1½ percent. A leopard never changes its spots, and here we find him still fighting the farmer. I say, therefore, that it is no wonder that in the State of Kansas we find the farmers, who are in control there, passing legislation against the laboring men of this country, and it is no wonder that we find the example of Kansas followed in other States.

Mr. President, in the State of North Dakota the laboring men have a very small vote in comparison with the farmers. Yet the Senators from North Dakota, over a period of years, have been most sympathetic with the labor organizations.

What do we find today? There is only one labor leader who is not fighting the farmer. The distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], a short time ago said that Mr. John L. Lewis was smart, that he was a great strategist, and the Senator intimated that we should reject the motion made by the distinguished Senator from Alabama because John L. Lewis might get a club.

I wish to say to the distinguished majority leader that I wish every labor leader in the United States were as sympathetic with the farmers as is John L.

Lewis, and any time the Democratic Party does not want in its ranks John L. Lewis, who raised half a million dollars for them only a few years ago, I am sure the Republican Party would gladly welcome Mr. Lewis with open arms.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Brooks in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. My reference to Mr. Lewis was occasioned by the fact that some of those who are advocating a motion to refer the bill thought it might be used as a club against Mr. Lewis, and I was wondering, and I still wonder, if that is the object of the motion to refer the bill—namely, that it may be pending and be used as a club against Mr. Lewis and those whom he represents, whether the threat of clubs might not be interchangeable, and that the very club they might want to use against Mr. Lewis might be used by him against them. I had no invidious remarks to make about Mr. Lewis' support of any party. As I understand, he is a very independent man; he supports whatever political party or whatever political candidate it seems to him at the time to be his duty to support. He has never been regarded, as I understand, either as a hide-bound Democrat or a hide-bound Republican, and is not so regarded now.

My reference to him has nothing whatever to do with any effort on his part to get out in the open field and find some other kind of club. I am talking about the club which was presented by the motion to refer the bill, because it could be held in the committee and used as a club against the laboring men in their demands for increase in wages. So if there is a club, it might be used by both sides; it might be used by either side; it might be an interchangeable club. That is the idea I had in mind in mentioning it at all. I still think that those who are trying to use it as a club against the working people may find it to be a club in behalf of the working people and in their interests.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished majority leader that the able Senator from Alabama more than 2 hours ago answered very ably indeed the suggestion made about Mr. Lewis having a club. He answered it so ably that I am certainly going to vote with the real leader of the farmers in the Senate to refer the bill. I ask the distinguished Senator from Kentucky to name to the Senate one farm leader who is opposed to the Bankhead measure. I ask him to name one farm leader of any standing in the country who is opposed to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have not canvassed the farm leaders as to how they stand on the Bankhead bill. I know they were not unanimous at all with respect to the Pace bill, which was before the Senate a few days ago and which is the companion bill to the Bankhead bill. I have not made any effort to canvass, either by conversation or by letter, to find out what is the attitude of

the men who claim to be leaders of the farmers. I have not been advised by all of them how they stand on the measure.

Besides that, Mr. President, with all respect to everyone who is a leader, or claims to be a leader, I think we should now and then exercise our own judgment concerning the wisdom of legislation. The Senator from North Dakota does not follow the dictates of all persons who try to control his vote. Probably if there had not been a farm leader in favor of this measure the Senator would have voted for it. I do not know about that, but I believe in all likelihood he would. The attitude of individual Senators ought to be controlled by their own judgment as to the wisdom of proposed legislation. When I referred to buttonholing awhile ago I was not referring to buttonholing done outside the Senate. I was talking about buttonholing done inside the Senate. I recognize the right of anyone to come here and talk to his Senator or to anyone else's Senator in regard to proposed legislation. That is a part of the right of petition which the Constitution guarantees to everyone. I do, however, deplore the habit which has prevailed for some time and which seems on the increase, that before the Senate shall have an opportunity to debate the merits of a proposition, Members of the Senate themselves buttonhole other Senators in an effort to commit them in advance, and frequently to their own embarrassment. I think Senators ought to use their own judgment and wait until they shall have themselves decided upon the wisdom of a measure before they act upon it. That is what I had reference to when I mentioned buttonholing.

Mr. LANGER. When I asked the distinguished Senator from Kentucky what farm organizations he knew that were opposed to the Bankhead measure, he very proudly stated—and it was necessary to hear him speak to know how proudly he said it—that he was a member of the Farm Bureau of the State of Kentucky. Yet, as a member of the Farm Bureau of the State of Kentucky, he now says he has not inquired with respect to the different farm leaders and their attitude toward the measure. He has not solicited them to ascertain their attitude. Yet the fact remains in the record that the distinguished Senator from Alabama has shown that every single farm leader, and that all farm organizations, are for once solidly behind this measure.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am a member of the Methodist Church, but I do not know how all the members of the Methodist Church stand on any vote I cast in the Senate, and I do not feel it to be my duty to consult them as to how I should vote. I belong to many fraternal organizations, of which I am proud, but I do not feel that I should wait for them to state their attitude before I decide how I shall vote on pending legislation. When people of my State sent me here they expected me to exercise my own judgment, in view of the conditions which exist at the time I am expected to cast a vote. I think the Senator from North Dakota, on the whole,

and by and large, perhaps with some exceptions, takes the same position as to his duties in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in that connection I wish to say that I noted with what pride the Senator from Kentucky read two telegrams received by him, one from a member of the Farm Bureau Federation in Kentucky, and another from a farmer of South Dakota, because they were in favor of not referring the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the telegram I read which came from my own State urged me to vote to override the President's veto, and the one I read from the farmer in South Dakota was in favor of sustaining the President's veto. They both came from farmers. I have not heard from either one of them respecting the motion to refer the bill, but I am satisfied that they would expect us to have the courage to do what we feel to be our duty in regard to the matter, in view of the situation that presents itself to us.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Kentucky said a couple of hours ago that there is not a Senator on this floor who will not sincerely try to do his duty when it comes to the matter of voting on the question of referring the measure. Nevertheless, I maintain that when the farmers' organizations for the first time in years got together solidly behind a measure, as they are now, that very situation is entitled to very great weight.

In conclusion, I simply wish to say that coming from the State of North Dakota, which is 2,000 miles or more away from the States of Alabama and South Carolina, I believe the farmers of my State will take off their hats to two Senators who are not interested in wheat, one of them being but slightly interested in corn, but who are nevertheless willing to rise on the floor of the Senate and lead the magnificent and splendid fight they have led for the farmers of the entire country. I personally would be ashamed to go home and meet my farmer constituents if I did not vote to refer this measure, and if there had been a vote on the question of the veto I should have voted to override the veto.

Mr. BARKLEY. If on yesterday, when we took up this matter, or on last Friday when the President's veto message was read, I had then moved to refer the bill and the President's veto to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry how would the Senator from North Dakota have voted on such a motion?

Mr. LANGER. I do not know how I would have voted on that motion. That is absolutely a hypothetical question. I cannot say how I would have voted.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator would not vote to refer the bill now except for the fact that he knows that enough votes cannot be obtained to pass the bill over the President's veto.

Mr. LANGER. I do not know about that. I have not buttonholed Senators to find out how they would vote. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not say that the Senator has buttonholed Senators, and I do not say that other Senators have buttonholed him, but, in view of the fact that the Senator is enthusiastically in favor of the motion to refer, I wonder how he would have voted if I had previously moved to refer the bill.

Mr. LANGER. I am not enthusiastic about the motion to refer. It will be my second choice vote. My first choice vote would be to override the President's veto.

Mr. BARKLEY. Why does not the Senator vote to override?

Mr. LANGER. If the Senator from Kentucky will give me a chance to do so I will.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am begging that the Senator from North Dakota may get a chance to vote on that question.

Mr. LANGER. If the Senator from Kentucky, as majority leader, can fix it up so I can vote on that question I shall certainly vote to override the veto.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say that there are some Senators I cannot influence to "fix it up," and the Senator from North Dakota is one of them. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I shall vote to send the bill back to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. However, if I had had the opportunity I would have voted to override the President's veto, not because I think such action would mean very much to the farmers of my State, and not because I think most of the farmers of my State are particularly interested in this particular piece of legislation. What the farmers of my State are interested in is to obtain sufficient labor to enable them to plant and harvest their crops. They have not been able to obtain sufficient labor, and are not going to be able to do so. The real problem confronting the farmer is that of getting sufficient help to plant and harvest his crops.

Mr. President, I think the farmers of the country are as patriotic a group as can be found in the United States. What irritates me most about the whole situation is that from the administration on down, the farmers of the country have been criticized as if they were responsible for the inflation which is with us. We have an inflation. Whether we override or do not override the President's veto, we shall have inflation in the United States. Neither the O. P. A. nor anyone else will be able to prevent it under existing circumstances.

I know, or I think I know, what is actuating some Members of the Senate. It is that if the bill is passed, the objection of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, labor will ask for higher wages for itself; and some Members of the Senate are afraid that passage of the bill over the veto might help John L. Lewis. I do not know why it would help him. After all, the problem of whether the miners of the country get a higher wage is a question for the mine operators and the union. I hear people denounce John L. Lewis. Let me say that I have disagreed with Mr. Lewis when he was with the C. I. O. I disagreed with him on the matter of sit-down strikes,

and I told him very frankly that I thought they were un-American and that the American people would not stand for them. I disagreed with Mr. Lewis when he came to see me at one time, at the request of the administration, on the Court issue. I told him that the attempt to "pack" the Court was wrong, and I told every other labor leader who came to me and urged me to vote to "pack" the Supreme Court that, in my judgment, they were wrong and that the time would come when some of the labor leaders would be hanging onto the bootstraps of the Constitution and of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. Lewis says that the miners should have an increase in their wages. I do not know whether he should or not; but I say that when we are considering the wages which are paid to the coal miners we should consider the fact that they work only an average of 2 or 3 days a week during the summer months. During that time they have to live on \$14 or \$21 a week. A great many people say, "They are getting \$7 a day; is not that enough for them?" But those who make that statement do not stop to think that the \$7 a day is paid for a full work-week only during the period of time when the demand for coal is very great. A large surplus of coal is banked up at the present time.

I am as much opposed to run-away inflation as is any other Member of the Senate. I know the evils of it. I have seen what has happened. I saw what happened to Germany. I was in Germany when the German inflation was under way, when the German mark went from 4 marks for \$1 to 20 marks for \$1. Then within a month, I saw it go from 20 marks for \$1 to 40 marks for \$1. Then, within 2 weeks, I saw it go to 60 marks for \$1, and then I watched it go from that, until it took almost a billion German marks—it seems incredible, but it is true—to buy a postage stamp with which to send a letter from Berlin to Washington, D. C. I do not want to see that sort of thing happen in these United States.

One thing which we must bear in mind when we talk about the farmers, and one thing which the labor leaders should bear in mind, is that it is necessary to have food, and that the farmer and his wife and his children are the ones who produce the food. If we do not allow the farmer a price for his products sufficiently high to enable him to hire labor and to pay higher wages to the labor he hires, how are we going to obtain the food we need? I think the labor leaders are making a serious mistake when they come to Washington and buttonhole Senators and urge them to vote against having the farmer get a decent price for his products. The farmer works, not 8 hours a day or 10 hours a day, but from early morning until late at night, and so does his wife, and so do his children. They work morning, noon, and night—all day, and sometimes late into the night—in order to produce the food needed by the very people who are complaining about them and who are urging that the Senate sustain the veto

to the bill, so that the farmers will not get higher prices for their products.

If there should be a sit-down strike by the farmers of the country, how could the laboring people live? If the farmers were to have an 8-hour day, how could the laboring people in the cities procure the food they need?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has mentioned the farmer's income. I should like to refer to testimony given before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The testimony was given last Wednesday by Donald E. Montgomery, consumer's counsel for the United Automobile, Aircraft and Agricultural Implement Workers, C. I. O. Mr. Montgomery testified as follows:

The estimates of the Department of Agriculture for 1942 indicate that half, the lower half, of the farm population did not break even on a cash basis in 1942. Their living expenses—and God knows they were miserably small—were larger than their cash income in that year.

Mr. Montgomery further testified that a break-down of the farm incomes showed that three-fourths of the farm families of the country had an income of approximately \$177 per capita a year, and that half of them had an income of only \$495 to \$500 per family, or about \$100 per capita a year.

Then the following occurred:

Senator AIKEN. According to your figures, the lower half, or 15,000,000 people, are living on farms which have an average cash income of only something like \$100 per capita?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. \$495 or \$500 per family.

Senator AIKEN. And isn't that the largest group of low-income people we have in the country today, and isn't that one of our very most important national problems?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Undoubtedly. And in this group of low-income families that I referred to here in my statement, probably a larger proportion of them are receiving less income than those in the city, although there are still a great many in the cities, who, when you take the rent they have to pay, \$23 or \$27 a month for a few congested rooms, and the city food prices they have to pay, they are in just about the same kind of shape as some of those folks on the farm we are talking about.

The man who gave that testimony, Mr. Montgomery, is a representative of the C. I. O., not a representative of the farm organizations. He testified to the pitifully small income received today by three-fourths of the farm families.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much for his contribution.

Let me say that, although I do not know what the situation is in other States, I do know that in my State the farm organizations and the farmers generally have favored high wages for the laboring people, and have never opposed decent wages for them. They have felt that if the laborer got good wages he would have more money to spend for the things the farmers produce.

Yet, as I said, now when the farmers ask for a little higher prices for the things they produce, so that they can hire labor in competition with the manufacturers who are operating under war contracts providing for cost of construction plus profits of 10 percent, we find that immediately the heads of the labor unions are opposed to having the farmers get any higher prices for their products.

What has caused the farm situation in this country? Yesterday, I called attention to an advertisement appearing in the Miles City Star, a daily newspaper in Montana. The advertisement stated, in effect, "Come over to the State of Washington, to Seattle, and work in a war industry. You will then be exempted from the draft, and you will get \$250 a month regardless of whether you have had any experience in the work."

Can any Member of the Senate tell me where in the United States there is a farmer—a cattle grower, a sheep grower, a wheat grower, or any other kind of a farmer—who can afford to pay his help \$250 a month and live? He simply cannot do it.

What are such advertisements doing? Miles City is the heart of the great stock section—the sheep-raising and cattle-raising area. Where is the farmer to get any men to help in lambing, where is he to get men to take care of the sheep, where is the stockman to get anybody to take care of his stock, unless he can get a price high enough so that he can offer the laboring man enough money in competition with war industries?

One of the things which has caused inflation—let us be frank about it—is the fact that war industries have been willing to pay any price, because the more they pay for labor and for lumber and other materials, the more money goes into the pockets of the owners of the industries.

When I was in Honolulu about 2 years ago my attention was called by some labor representatives to the fact that some of the contractors in defense industries were buying cement and wasting it. They were buying lumber, using it once for forms, and then throwing it away, because the more they used the greater were their profits. Yet no Senator rises on the floor of the Senate to denounce the men who are receiving great sums of money from war contracts. Nothing is said about them. The administration is not denouncing them. The administration is responsible for the huge profits being made in the shipbuilding industry and other industries. Those are the things which are causing inflation. It is not the poor farmer and his wife and children, who are working 10, 12, 14, or 16 hours a day. I cannot understand the philosophy of anyone who says that the farmers are responsible for inflation. Anyone who knows anything about the stock business, whether he be a sheep grower or a cattle grower, knows that the price for which the farmer sells his wool has very little to do with the cost of clothing. We know very well that the price for which the farmer sells his wheat has very little to do with the cost of bread or

pastry in the East; yet the argument has been made that the farmer is responsible for inflation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Senator will remember that testimony before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry showed that when sweetpotatoes were selling in the South for a dollar a bushel on the farm, they were selling in grocery stores in the cities for \$4 a bushel. The farmer received \$1 and the consumer paid \$4.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Irish potatoes were selling in Maine for approximately 60 cents a bushel at a time when the consumers in the cities were paying \$6 a bushel. That was brought out in the testimony before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last fall.

The Senator will remember that there was complaint that farm prices were not what they ought to be. When we asked Mr. Henderson about it, he said that he could not establish the millennium. It was pointed out that those who bought potatoes at a dollar a bushel and sold them to the consumer for \$4 a bushel were protected under the law. They had a millennium. The reason for that was, as he said, that when we enacted the law we included a provision that, no matter what the price was to the farmer, the regular practices of those who handled his commodities should not be interfered with.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. I thank the Senator for calling my attention to it.

Mr. President, I am about to conclude. I deplore the fact that labor leaders have taken the position which they have taken. They claim that they wish to make an alliance with the farmers, and that they are the friends of the farmers. Certainly the farmers generally have been the friends of labor, because they felt that if labor should receive a better wage the farmers would have a chance of obtaining more for their products.

I regret exceedingly that the administration has taken the position that the farmer is causing inflation. I think it is ridiculous for anybody to make the statement that the farmer is responsible. I believe that is the wrong approach. Consequently I regret that so many Senators who voted overwhelmingly to pass the bill immediately turn around and intend to sustain the veto. We march up the hill, turn around, and march down again whenever the whip is cracked.

What changed the minds of so many Senators overnight? Did some of the manufacturers get busy and say, "We want cheap raw materials"? Is that the reason? Was it because some of the mills wanted it? Was it because labor leaders wanted it?

Senators say that they will not be guided by somebody who asks them to vote this way or that way. The Senate voted overwhelmingly for the bill. There

were only two votes against it. Did Senators think it was right then? Did they think it was the honest thing to do then? Did they believe, when they voted for it, that it would cause a dangerous inflation which would destroy the country? Did they think then that it would give John L. Lewis a whip so that he could get an increase in wages for those whom he represents? Or did they vote blindly, without knowing what they were doing? Will Senators say that they did not know what they were doing, and that the only reason they have changed their minds is that the President sent Congress a message?

There is nothing new in the message, nothing that every Member of the Senate did not know. No new fact is stated. I will refuse to march up the hill, turn around, and march down again merely because the President sends a message to Congress saying that he does not like the bill.

We cannot blame the farmers for feeling aggrieved when they see manufacturers receiving large profits and growing rich from war contracts. We cannot blame the farmers for feeling that they have been mistreated when they see farm labor leaving the stockmen and cattlemen and going into war industries, leaving the farmers without help.

The farmers are asked to increase their output by 30 percent, and an appeal is made to their patriotism. As I stated a few moments ago, no class of people in the United States is more patriotic and more in favor of preserving democracy in the United States than are the farmers. If we are to destroy and put out of business the small farmer, we shall destroy democracy in the United States. The farmer and the small businessman constitute the backbone of a democratic republic.

Mr. President, I am sorry that it is necessary to send the bill back to the committee. If it is to be sent back to the committee I believe that the committee should hold hearings and give the whole question a thorough airing to show up the inconsistency of some of the economists in the O. P. A., and the false position taken by them.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it was not my intention to make any comment with respect to the veto message, but in view of the fact that the basic commodity of corn is, in my humble opinion, the one most affected, and in view of the fact that no one on the floor of the Senate to whom I have listened has described what seems to me to be the true situation of the corn farmer in the Middle West, I believe I would be derelict in my duty as a Member of the United States Senate, and as one who comes from what is called the heart of the Corn Belt section, did I not at least briefly explain what I understand to be the true situation in the country today, insofar as the corn farmer is concerned.

Mr. President, I was a member of the House of Representatives when the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act was passed by the Congress. Any of my colleagues who were Members of the Congress at that time, or any who are

familiar with the farm legislation of the Congress, will recall that the act referred to was passed after the Supreme Court of the United States invalidated, on constitutional grounds, the triple A.

The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act is a creature of the Government and was passed by the Congress at the request of the President of the United States for the primary purpose of protecting the soil of this country which, through erosion and deterioration, and the lack of rotation of crops, had caused the best agricultural minds of the country to become alarmed at what might happen to the top soil of the agricultural sections of the Nation. The declaration of policy in the act said: "That it is hereby declared the policy of the Congress to conserve national resources, prevent the wasteful use of soil fertility, and preserve, maintain, and rebuild farm lands in the national public interest."

In the House of Representatives on February 20, 1936, in discussing the divided opinion of the United States Supreme Court in holding the Agricultural Adjustment Act unconstitutional, among other things, I said:

Section 8 is the crux of the temporary program to meet the present emergency. An abstract of that section discloses that the Secretary of Agriculture shall make payments or grants to agricultural producers, based upon treatment of land for soil restoration, conservation, prevention of erosion, changes in the land, or a domestic allotment percentage. In obtaining this information county or community committees of agricultural producers may be utilized, but it is expressly stated that no one has any power to enter into a contract which is binding upon the producers. This provision was written to meet the objection laid down by the Supreme Court in the Butler case. No farmer is required to do anything under this program. He may cooperate with the committee on soil conservation and be rewarded therefor, or he may do as he pleases.

The Federal Government, under this bill, is primarily interested in soil conservation and not in the control of agricultural commodities. Such control is only incidental to the main objective.

Mr. President, I repeat merely for the information of the Senate this expression which I made in the House of Representatives with respect to the soil-conservation program.

In other words, the control program, under which parity and benefit payments have been made, is incidental to the soil-conservation program. The soil-conservation program was initiated by the Government for the primary purpose of saving the soil of America for future generations. Those who were Members of the Congress at the time may recall the interesting debates we had with respect to soil conservation. China was cited frequently to show what soil erosion had done to that great nation. So, a legitimate argument can be made that soil-conservation payments in no way should be considered in connection with parity and benefit payments.

That is the position which the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations have consistently taken for many years.

In other words, the Government has said "Mr. Farmer if you will protect your land for the future generations to come, we will pay you a commensurate amount for so doing."

I merely mention that in passing, because the soil-conservation payments are constantly referred to in the veto message as well as the debates here on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, last September, the Thomas amendment was before the Senate—I was the only member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who voted against bringing the proposed legislation to the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Illinois said then that it was dangerously inflationary, and I also said that it would in no way help the farmers in my section of the country. It will be recalled that the Thomas amendment was adopted by the Senate by a vote of 47 to 42.

A few weeks ago when the Pace bill came before the Agricultural Committee of the Senate, it was my misfortune to be absent, but after I learned that the Pace bill had been approved by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and was reported favorably to the Senate, I immediately took the same position with respect to the Pace bill which I had taken with respect to the Thomas amendment last September. I maintained then, and I maintain now, that the Pace bill is dangerously inflationary, and that the veto message of the President upon the Bankhead bill could well be applied to the Pace bill.

I merely mention these two incidents, Mr. President, to advise the Senate and the country that the Senator from Illinois is just as much interested in the control of inflation in this country as is anyone else.

I appreciate what the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] said with respect to turning loose a tornado of inflation upon the country. Both these distinguished Senators made thought-provoking speeches. Both are to be commended for the high, patriotic position they have taken.

I have also listened to other addresses. Certainly I cannot agree with those who say that inflation cannot be controlled. I know that a modicum of inflationary conditions is with us now, and I agree that we cannot turn an inflationary tornado loose, as has been suggested by some, without wrecking the economy of the home front, but I emphatically deny that what the corn farmer seeks at this moment will be the means of igniting the torch of inflation. Later on I shall submit facts and figures that convince me of the soundness of this position. I shall not discuss the wheat situation or the sugar situation; I shall discuss only the corn problem, as I see it, and I shall read certain portions of the veto message of the President as my premise for so doing.

On page 1 the President says:

In my message of September 7, 1942, * * * I further stated: "The purpose should be to hold farm prices at parity, or at levels of a recent date, whichever is higher. * * *

And in determining whether a commodity has reached parity, we should include all the benefits received by the farmer from his Government under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration program, allocable to the particular commodity. For it is unfair to give the farmer a parity price and in addition give him far more than parity."

Mr. President, that is the statement that caused me to refer as I did to the soil-conservation payments. Insofar as parity payments are concerned, we are appropriating at the present time \$212,000,000 for certain basic commodities. Insofar as soil conservation is concerned, the payments on those commodities are made to every class of farmers who comply with the program. It should be understood that parity payments fluctuate. When the farmer gets a parity price for his wheat or his corn or his cotton or his rice or his tobacco, at that moment money ceases to be taken out of the Treasury of the United States and the farmer gets nothing in the form of parity payments. So today if the five basic commodities were selling for parity, it would not be necessary to take a dime or a nickel out of the Treasury of the United States to pay the parity price to the farmers who were cooperating with the program. So there would be eliminated the \$212,000,000, or whatever portion thereof might be needed to pay parity to the farmer who cooperates with the program. Only two basic commodities are under parity, namely, wheat and corn.

On page 2 of the message, the President says:

In the past no one has fought harder than I to help the farmers get parity prices for their crops. With pride I recall that the parity idea was first put into law during my administration. And by the act of October 2, 1942, the farmers were guaranteed 90 percent of parity prices for all basic crops, not only during the war, but for at least 2 years from the 1st day of January following the declaration of the termination of the war.

Mr. President, there certainly can be no dispute about that statement. The present President of the United States has been the best friend of the farmer who ever sat in the White House. We all know about the farmer's plight back in 1932, when Roosevelt was elected. Leading agriculturists, both Democrats and Republicans, came to Washington in 1933 to talk with the President about the dire plight of agriculture. After a series of conferences he told the farmers to write a bill, and he said, "Whatever you decide will alleviate your economic troubles I will approve." The A. A. A. was the result of this conference and that was the first constructive step to aid the farmer. Franklin D. Roosevelt was the first President who demonstrated any sympathetic interest in a farmer's program. He was the first President who did not exercise his veto power on farm legislation for a period of about 12 years. During previous administrations, Republicans and Democrats alike from the great farm belts were constantly trying to put through the McNary-Haugen bill and other beneficial farm legislation but every time they passed a bill it encountered a veto by a Republican President of the United States.

Mr. President, even though the veto message on the Bankhead bill should be sustained, as it would have been if it had been voted on, the American farmers should not condemn the President of the United States on that account, because, after all, over a period of 10 years, he has been the greatest and the best friend the farmer has ever had. There is not a farmer in my section of the country who has not more money in the bank at this particular moment than he has had at any period during the last 30 years; but the farmer, like everyone else, is disturbed. He sees, as some have said, large wages being paid here and there in defense industries; he feels that he is being discriminated against, and, even though he is getting along all right, he still thinks he would like to get along a little better because someone else is earning more than he believes is justified. The President further says:

But it must be recognized that parity prices are only means to get parity income for the farmers. That income goal has been attained for the cooperating producers of all basic crops.

The word "cooperating" is exceedingly interesting, Mr. President. I shall discuss it later.

On page 5 of the message the President says:

It is difficult to forecast the actual price increase which would result under the Bankhead bill, and the estimates I have received differ widely. They all agree, however, that they will be substantial, although there is some difference of opinion as to the time when they will occur. It cannot be denied, however, that the Bankhead bill takes from the Government the power to prevent very substantial increases in food prices. That is its only purpose.

Mr. President, here is something in the message which to me is most interesting. I do not want to offer any criticism of anyone in connection with the Agricultural Committee of the Senate. However, this is another bill which has been reported to the Senate and passed by the House without any hearings. All this controversy now rages around inflation; even the President of the United States has not the facts and figures to tell exactly what is going to happen with respect to inflation, if this bill should pass and he so states in this message. Certainly the Senate has not the facts and the figures, and it seems to me that important legislation of this kind, when it comes before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the committee, instead of hurrying it through on to the floor of the Senate, should take some time to consider it and hold hearings upon it. Perhaps I am as guilty as is anyone else because I am a member of that committee. We have the example of this bill, and we have the example of the Pace bill, which was recommitted to the Committee on Agriculture for that very reason. Let us in the future profit by this experience.

The President further says in his veto message—

Under the Bankhead bill the price of sugar could rise a cent and a half a pound.

I have not looked into that.

He also says—

The price of bread might go up a cent a loaf and the price of flour proportionately.

I am not discussing the wheat situation or the bread situation; that is left for men who are more familiar with this problem.

He also states—

The price of corn could rise almost 10 percent, which might not necessitate, but would certainly call forth a demand for higher prices for hogs, and livestock, poultry, eggs, milk, and other dairy products. That demand would be particularly insistent in the case of poultry, eggs, milk, and other dairy products where customary feed cost ratios would be substantially reduced.

You will note the comment of the President should the price of corn rise 10 percent.

Mr. President, this is all important. I submit that no demand would be made for higher prices if this should happen. I now desire to quote some figures to prove my point. What is the situation with respect to the corn supply of the Nation? The total supply of corn in 1942-43 will be 3,660,000,000 bushels; the amount of corn to be used for feed will be 2,600,000 bushels.

The amount to be used for seed, meal, breakfast food, alcohol, and export, is 300,000,000 bushels. The remainder of the total supply to be carried over is 760,000,000 bushels.

Please follow me, Senators, on this.

Eighty percent of all the corn that is produced in this country is fed to hogs, cattle, horses, and poultry, and out of that 80 percent, 49 percent of the corn is fed to hogs, 11 percent to dairy cattle, 10 percent to beef cattle, 10 percent to horses, 18 percent to poultry, and 2 percent is used for stock in the cities.

Let us examine the parity and actual price of animals used for human consumption.

Mr. President, at the present time hogs carry an actual price of \$14.67 a hundredweight. The parity price is \$11.70 a hundredweight. Does anyone believe that because corn might go to the parity price, through the law of supply and demand, the producer of hogs is going to demand more for the hogs he produces? Forty-nine percent of the corn that is raised is fed by the hog producer to his hogs. There is not a chance for him to demand more. He is making today more money than ever before. His demand would be met by a flat "No" in the O. P. A.

The actual price of calves a hundred pounds is \$14.45, the parity price is \$10.87. The price of cattle per hundred is \$12.80, the parity price is \$8.73. Twelve percent of the corn is fed to cattle. Does anyone think the cattleman is going to ask for more for his cattle, when only 8½ cents more would be added to the price of the bushel of corn to feed those cattle, if it reached parity. There is not a chance for the cattleman to complain. He is in the same position as the producer of hogs.

What about chickens? The actual price of chickens is 23.5 cents a pound. The parity price is 18.4 cents. The actual price of butterfat, which comes

from dairy feed, is 50.5 cents a pound. The parity is 42.9 cents a pound. And so it goes.

There is not a single one of these commodities that is not far above the parity price, and the combined industries depend primarily upon corn as the commodity with which to produce the cattle, the hogs, and the poultry of this country. And it should be noted that these food supplies to civilians and soldiers are the basic ones.

If corn went to parity, it would not hurt anyone in this country except the farmers. The consumers are only slightly affected. We would say to the man who is selling hogs and cattle, "We are going to take from you a part of your profit involving the increase of 8½ cents per bushel in corn and give it to the farmer, who produces the corn for your hogs and your cattle and your poultry." That is all there is to this. What applies to the hog producer applies to all the other producers because their products are all far above parity.

With respect to the amount of corn that is to be used for seed, meal, breakfast food, alcohol, and exports, there are 300,000,000 bushels. The seed corn remains on the farm. The corn which goes for alcohol has no effect upon the consuming public. The corn which is exported has nothing to do with the price the consumer has to pay. So I imagine that for seed and meal a hundred million bushels of corn would be a large amount to be considered in this problem. Senators can figure what a hundred million bushels of corn at 8 or 10 cents a bushel would amount to, and how it would affect the consuming public, so far as that commodity is concerned, or insofar as inflation is concerned.

Mr. President, what is involved in this program is merely an economic and equitable adjustment among the farmers themselves. That is all that is involved. It will not injure the consumer one iota, in the humble opinion of the Senator from Illinois.

The irony of the entire situation with respect to corn is that sometime ago a measure was passed in the Senate, also passed by the House and approved by the President, which provided that we could sell, at 85 percent of parity, the corn which the Commodity Credit Corporation had on hand, for feed and alcohol purposes, but that if we sold any other corn for processing or export purposes, the Government must get the parity price for the corn.

What has happened? As a result of the impasse in Congress, as a result of the Executive decree which said that the corn farmer can get only a certain percent of parity for his corn—the corn farmer is holding his corn. He does not know what is going to happen. He knows that if it were not for the ceiling which has been placed upon the price of his corn by the Government decree, it would go to the parity price in a couple of weeks. So he is holding his corn. And what happens? The man who is raising hogs, the man who is raising cattle, the man who is raising poultry, is suffering right now because of his in-

ability to buy corn from the corn farmer in this country. So serious is it that the Commodity Credit Corporation has been compelled to sell to certain processors some 2,000,000 bushels of corn for war purposes, at the parity price.

What an anomaly. We say to the Government, through a law, you cannot sell at less than parity the corn you have on hand as the result of taking it over under the Commodity Credit Corporation default loans. The President says by an Executive order, through the O. P. A., you cannot sell your corn for more than 94 cents a bushel.

Mr. President, that is the situation in which we find ourselves in respect to corn, and it is a serious situation. It is serious not only from the standpoint of the farmer getting another 8 cents a bushel for his corn, but it is serious from the standpoint of the war effort, and I am more interested in the war effort than any other thing. When the farmer has to sell his flock of sheep or his herd of cattle, or a carload of hogs at a time before they are ready for market—and that is exactly what he is beginning to wonder about and what he is doing—then we are just losing the poundage which should go into those hogs or cattle or sheep, as a result of the corn dilemma which exists in this country at the present time.

I received a message some time ago from a man living in the vicinity of Belvidere, Ill., who has 15,000 sheep, and he said, "If I cannot get some corn immediately, I shall have to sell these sheep on the market before they are ready to go on the market." That is what I am complaining about. When a man sells his sheep or hogs or cattle before they are ready to go, he is taking away the best part of the animal, so far as ultimate consumption is concerned, and it affects both civilian economy and military economy. I do not know on what basis corn was pegged at its present price by Executive order.

I repeat, Mr. President, all that is involved is an equitable adjustment among the farmers themselves, to give a little more to the man who produces and take it away from the fellow who is raising cattle and hogs and sheep and poultry. That is what we are doing, making an equitable adjustment so far as the corn situation is concerned.

There is another situation to which I should call attention. Many farmers are not cooperators with the program, and many cannot cooperate because they are not in the commercial corn-producing area.

I here and now present some figures for 1942. Bushels of corn in the commercial corn-producing area benefited by parity payments, 1,200,000,000. Bushels of corn in the commercial corn-producing area not benefited by parity payments, 970,000,000.

Sixty-eight percent of all corn is grown in the commercial corn-producing area, and unless a farmer produces in the commercial corn-producing area he is not entitled to any parity payments. He is entitled to soil conservation payments, but not to parity payments.

Fifty-five percent of corn produced in the commercial corn area in 1942 received parity payments. Forty-five percent of corn in the commercial corn-producing area did not receive parity payments. Thirty-eight percent of all the corn in the United States received parity payments.

In other words, 62 percent of the corn raised in America did not participate in the parity payments because the farmers are not cooperators; some of them are not cooperators because they are outside the commercial corn-producing area, and some farmers who cooperate with the program cannot receive parity payments on every bushel they produce because we have what is called an acreage quota. For example, if I have 100 corn acres in Illinois and I am a cooperator I am told, "Senator, you can plant the 100 acres, and based on an average of 5 years we will give you a quota of 50 bushels per acre." If my land produced the next year 75 bushels per acre I do not receive any parity payments on the excess over 50 bushels per acre. So that excess is not figured in making up the payments.

Mr. President, only 38 percent of the farmers in the country, so far as the producing of corn is concerned, are benefiting by the parity payments. That is something that should be called to the attention of the country.

Mr. President, I have said all I wanted to say with respect to corn in Illinois and in the Midwest. The figures were of such importance to me that I thought I should lay them before the Senate of the United States at the present time for whatever they are worth.

I am alarmed so far as the corn situation is concerned. I honestly believe that sooner or later there must come an adjustment of some kind with respect to the corn if we expect to release it from the cribs and the warehouses and the bins where it is being held at the present time.

Mr. President, as I view the situation it is serious. I have talked on the subject before. I have given out statements to the press along this line. I have discussed the matter with men high in the Department of Agriculture and high officials in the Government, and have tried to give them the benefit of my advice, and whatever wisdom I may have upon a serious situation with respect to the way corn is being handled in the country today.

I sincerely hope that the corn dilemma of the Nation will soon be solved. It will do much to restore confidence and aid the war effort in the Midwest, because it is just—it is fair, it is right—and it is not inflationary.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the vote upon the motion. Hence I shall speak very briefly.

The bill passed the Senate on the 25th of last February. I was not present on that occasion. I was in my State of Oklahoma. It was passed by a vote of 78 in favor to 2 against. Had I been present one more vote would have been cast in the affirmative and the record of

the vote would have shown at least 79 to be for the bill and 2 against it.

After the bill was passed by the Senate and was sent to the House, it was considered by the House, and as I remember the bill received a favorable vote in the House in the ratio of 4 to 1. The bill then went to the President and the President has returned the bill with his objections. We have now before us the President's veto message. Under the Constitution, when a bill is returned with the objections of the President the House which originated the bill is presumed forthwith to reconsider the bill. We are now reconsidering the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. President, the bill has to do with subsidies. The bill had for its purpose the elimination of subsidies. As I construe the bill and its provisions the Members of this body who voted for the bill voted to get rid of subsidies, and the vote on that bill was 78 to 2. So it is my construction now that those who are in favor of subsidy are against the bill, and those who are against subsidies are in favor of the passage of the bill notwithstanding the objections of the President.

Mr. President, I am against subsidies, and I regret that I will not be permitted to cast a direct vote upon that issue. The motion pending before the Senate is to refer the message, which carries the bill with it, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for further consideration and report.

Mr. President, the fight here today and the fight made yesterday is nothing more than a prelude to a fight which is yet to come. When the agricultural appropriation bill shall come before this body it probably will carry items in the nature of subsidy appropriations to enable the Department to make subsidy payments, either in the form of parity payments or soil-conservation payments or incentive payments to farmers who cooperate to the end that they may have a full parity income. So, Mr. President, it is the purpose of this bill, or the effect of the bill, if left in its present form, to keep the price of corn and the price of cotton and the price of wheat down below parity price—that is, to the farmer.

If the Department can keep the price of corn below parity, and can keep the price of cotton below parity, and can keep the price of wheat below parity, then the Department can come to the Congress later on during this session and ask Congress to appropriate money to enable the Department to make payments to these farmers, making up the difference between the price they receive and the full parity price.

Mr. President, it is my judgment that if this bill had become law, eliminating as it does parities, that the price of cotton would soon reach parity, and it is not far from parity now. The price of wheat would soon reach parity. It is not far from parity now. Likewise the price of corn would soon reach parity, and it is not very far from parity now.

So that if the bill should have become law the country would have known that we were against such subsidies, the parity prices of these commodities would

have been reached, and there would be no occasion for the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate to carry items in the forthcoming bill to make up the difference between what the farmer receives for his commodities and the full parity price.

Mr. President, I am against subsidies. I am against a parity subsidy. I am against the incentive subsidy. I am against the soil-conservation subsidy. For that reason I was for the original bill. But I was in my home State at the time that the vote on it was taken, hence I could not vote upon it. The RECORD shows that had I been present I would have voted for the bill.

If this bill fails of final passage, which means if the veto is sustained, then many farm prices will be hammered down by means well known to the agents of the Government, and then in order for farmers to secure parity income they must accept subsidies to make up the difference between the prices received and the full parity prices.

From whence will these subsidies come? The answer is from the United States Treasury.

Where will the Treasury get the money to pay the subsidies?

The answer: There are but three possible sources: First, from taxes, which means that the people must pay additional taxes to raise more funds to pay subsidies to farmers; second, from funds derived from the sale of stamps and bonds; however, to get funds from the sale of stamps and bonds the people must buy more bonds and stamps. Third, from funds secured through the creation of credit in the banks of the country. This will mean that additional bonds will be printed and thereafter deposited in the banks, thereby creating the additional credit necessary with which to make the subsidy payments.

This program of a continuation of subsidies means that the people shall be required to pay more taxes, buy more stamps and bonds, and to pay more interest on more bonds to pay subsidies to farmers.

Again I say I am opposed to subsidies. At this time subsidies are not necessary and, in my opinion, they cannot be justified.

Mr. President, I stated a moment ago that this is simply the prelude to another fight which will come along later. This does not settle the issue. This bill which we have before us will be followed by another bill, as I understand, now on my desk before me, proposing to increase the salaries of the Federal employees of the Government. A short time ago the Congress passed a bill raising the salaries of certain of our Federal employees by 10 percent. A little later the Congress passed a second bill raising the salaries of postal employees by a considerable sum.

I understand that just as soon as the pending motion and the pending bill shall be disposed of, Senate bill 635 will come before the Senate. According to the committee report—

The major purpose of S. 635 is to provide employees of the Government with additional

compensation for the purpose of enabling them to meet wartime living costs.

We also have on the calendar House bill 8160. Both bills relate to the same subject and have for their purpose an increase—by the payment of overtime compensation—in the salaries of the public officials and employees of the Government. There are approximately 2,000,000 of them. If those bills are passed and if the salaries of Federal employees are raised on the average \$300 per employee, we can determine what will be the resultant increase by multiplying 2,000,000 by \$300; and we arrive at a sum of approximately \$600,000,000.

Mr. President, there seems to be no trouble in getting through the Congress a bill raising salaries. There seems to be no trouble in getting through the Congress a bill for the benefit of certain classes of our citizens; but when there comes before the Congress a bill seeking to give the farmer some increase in income—not an enormous profit, perhaps not a profit at all, but to permit the prices for his products to go up to parity—we have difficulty and trouble.

Mr. President, we have a way of measuring prices and values. During the present discussion we have heard much said about the spiral of inflation that the country is in. I think the record should be made clear from time to time as to just what is the status of the inflation movement. On various occasions I have taken the floor to make the RECORD clear as to what is the status of inflation in the country. During the last 11 months beginning on the second day of May, 1942, and continuing to the present time—and that is a little more than 11 months—the general price level has risen 4.6 percent. I want that statement to appear twice in the RECORD; so I repeat that, since the 2d of last May, more than 11 months ago, the general price level in the country has risen only 4.6 percent. That rise has been at the rate of 1 mill a week, Mr. President. That is based upon wholesale prices, of course. Some 900 wholesale prices are considered in making up the price index; and of course wholesale prices are to a large extent based upon the prices of raw products. Farmers produce raw products; they produce wheat which must be processed; they produce corn which must be processed; most of the commodities the farmers produce must be processed before they reach the consumers. So I take it that the commodities considered in making up the wholesale price index are, in the main, raw products.

Therefore, Mr. President, the farmer does not share and has not shared the benefits of the so-called increase or so-called inflation. I contend that a price level which can be held down in times like these to a rise of 4.6 percent in 11 months does not mean that we are in a spiral of inflation, and I contend that so far as wholesale prices are concerned we have but little inflation. The inflation comes in the prices which the processors and retailers have added to the wholesale prices, and, of course, it is true that the processors and retailers receive as much, if not more, of the consumer's

dollar than is received by the men who produce the raw materials.

So, Mr. President, as I stated a moment ago, the present situation is simply a prelude to a fight which will come later on. If the President's veto of the pending bill shall be sustained, nothing will have been settled, because the moment the Senate receives from the House the bill which it is contemplated will provide for the making of subsidy payments for agriculture, that bill will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and there the subject will be re-explored, and from that committee a report will be made to the Senate. If the bill, when reported, carries an item for subsidy payments, that issue must be fought out on this floor. As one member of the Committee on Appropriations, I say that unless I hear arguments which I have not yet heard, I shall vote against the inclusion of any subsidy payments of any kind or character in the forthcoming appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. BURTON. Merely so that the RECORD may be correct, for the purpose of the discussion which will occur on the bill following the pending bill, let me say that I believe the Senator referred to it as a bill for the increase of pay of civil-service employees, and estimated that it might involve an increase of \$300 a person for 2,000,000 employees, or a total pay increase of \$600,000,000. I want the RECORD to show that the bill, as reported by the Senate committee, and as it will come before the Senate, retains the present rates of pay for Federal employees doing overtime work. Although the bill as introduced involved a \$200,000,000 increase, as reported to the Senate it does not change the rate of pay. So far as the increased cost under that item is concerned, it amounts to only about \$5,000,000. I merely wish to make that statement in order to have the RECORD made correct at this time.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I am glad to have the Senator make that statement. I know he is a member of the committee, and I know that any statement he makes is accurate. I am glad to have the RECORD made correct.

However, Mr. President, I had in mind a statement of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] that if the bill is passed, it and other bills previously passed will have the effect of raising the salaries of all Federal employees between \$500,000,000 and \$600,000,000 a year.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that I think the substance of the Senator's statement is correct. The bill we passed last December continued in effect about \$200,000,000 of overtime pay previously authorized, and added approximately \$200,000,000. There is the difference. Altogether the bills provide for increases amounting to approximately \$600,000,000. The bill which is

about to come before the Senate for consideration provided for an increase of approximately another \$200,000,000 as it was introduced, but as it comes before the Senate from the Committee on the Civil Service this increase is eliminated.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, to the extent that I might have inferred that the one bill would raise the salaries \$600,000,000, I was in error. The bill which shortly will come before the Senate will assist in raising the total salaries \$600,000,000; and it, together with bills previously passed, will have the effect of raising the salaries some \$600,000,000.

Mr. President, there is no charge that that increase is to be inflationary. It gives 2,000,000 people more money with which to buy less goods; and to my mind such a proceeding is a highly inflationary one. There is no charge that either one of the bills, taken either separately or together, will be the cause of further increasing the prices in the country, which in the end is inflation.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield to me, let me say, without encumbering the RECORD further, that I wish to point out that the measure passed last December was merely to bring the salaries of Federal employees approximately into line with those of all other persons in the United States, or at least nearly into line with their salaries, in order that there might be some additional allowance for the increased cost of living, even though it might not equal it fully. I believe that during the last war approximately \$240 per person was added to the pay, and this time the increase amounts to approximately \$300.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I appreciate the additional statement made by the able Senator; but, nevertheless, the bill does increase the salaries of approximately 2,000,000 persons; and to that extent the salary increase bills are inflationary.

Mr. President, where are we to get the \$600,000,000 which we already have voted and are about to vote to our employees? I voted for the two bills which have previously been passed, and I shall vote for the one which is coming on. Likewise, every chance I get I vote to give the farmer a slight increase, along with the increases enjoyed by the other people of the country. For the industrial program which we now are carrying on, those in charge of it have been so liberal in making the contracts that the contractors—the corporations—have made so much money that some of them have become embarrassed and have voluntarily turned back to the Public Treasury a part of their profits.

On the other hand, the Congress has taken steps to enact legislation providing for the renegotiation of contracts. It is contended that already we have recovered for the Treasury hundreds of millions of dollars of excess profits. It is further contended that before the renegotiation program is completed we shall have recovered for the Public Treasury at least \$1,000,000,000 of excess profits.

That means that the corporations, contractors, and others who have had dealings with the Government have not sustained losses but have made reasonable profits. When it comes to the farmer, however, Congress is not willing to give him even parity prices for his products.

Mr. President, there are five or six hundred thousand farmers who are not cooperators. The noncooperating farmers do not share in any of the subsidy payments. All they get for their produce is what they can secure in the market places; and when they sell their cotton, corn, cattle, or wheat on the market they get the market price, and that is all they get.

I wish to place in the RECORD at this point some figures showing how the stockholders of the various corporations in the country are faring at the present time. I make the bold statement that everyone in this country except the farmer has the opportunity of making money at this time.

I have before me a statement prepared by Babson's Reports, Inc., published at Babson Park, Mass. This statement shows the names of approximately 200 corporations, the stock prices at the lowest point in 1942, the prices on March 16, 1943, and the percentage of increase from the low point in 1942 until March 16, 1943.

The first name on the list is Allied Chemical. The percentage of increase in the price of the stock of this concern from the low point in 1942 to March 16, 1943, is 31.2 percent. Let me read a few more of the items. In the case of Amerada the increase was 77.9 percent; American Can, 37.8 percent; American Car & Foundry, 68.7 percent; American & Foreign Power, 6 percent preferred, 263 percent; American Home Products, 68.1 percent; American Locomotive, preferred, 40 percent; American Power & Light, \$5 preferred, 102 percent.

Mr. President, I shall not read all the figures. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the list of corporations, together with the percentage of increase in the price of the stock from the low point of 1942 to March 16, 1943. I do not ask that the values of the stocks in 1942 or 1943 be printed. I think it will suffice to show opposite the name of each corporation the percentage of increase in the price of the stock during the period mentioned. The average increase in the price of preferred and common stock during this period was 40.6 percent.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Percent
Allied Chemical.....	31.2
Amerada.....	77.9
American Can.....	37.8
American Car & Foundry.....	68.7
American & Foreign Power 6 percent preferred.....	263.0
American Home Products.....	68.1
American Locomotive preferred.....	40.0
American Power & Light, \$5 preferred.....	102.0
American Telephone & Telegraph Co.....	38.8
American Tobacco B.....	49.1

	Percent		Percent		Percent
Atchison	93.2	Martin G. L. Co.	26.1	United States Rubber	144.0
Atlantic Coast Line	59.5	Masonite Corporation	61.5	United States Rubber preferred	101.3
Bell Aircraft	106.6	Mathieson Alkali	34.6	United States Steel	22.0
Bendix	34.9	May Department Stores	47.6	Universal Leaf Tobacco	56.7
Bohn-Aluminum	82.0	McGraw Electric	76.9	Vick Chemical	40.0
Borg-Warner	57.6	McIntyre Porcupine	63.3	Virginia-Carolina Chemical, 6 percent preferred	140.0
Bulova	47.4	Mid-Continental Petroleum	88.8	Wayne Pump	97.9
Campbell Wyant	52.6	Minneapolis Honeywell	74.7	Western Auto Supply	83.4
Caterpillar Tractor	56.6	Montgomery Ward	61.7	Western Union Telegraph	44.4
Celanese	115.9	Motor Products	106.0	Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing	39.4
Cerro de Pasco	34.7	Motor Wheel	49.4	White Motor	52.1
Chesapeake & Ohio	50.9	Mueller Brass	35.4	Woolworth	62.8
Chrysler	66.3	Nash Kelvinator	144.2	Wrigley, W., Jr.	74.4
Clark Equipment	33.0	Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis	122.5	Yale & Towne	52.8
Cleveland Graphite	64.2	National Biscuit	46.1	Youngstown Sheet & Tube	26.6
Climax Molybdenum	38.0	National Cash Register	126.1	Zenith Radio	190.0
Cluett Peabody	38.4	National Dairy	40.1		
Coca-Cola	75.2	National Distillers	55.4		
Colgate, Palmolive	59.8	New York Air Brake	35.0		
Collins & Aikman	110.7	New York Central	117.0		
Columbia Broadcasting A.	111.9	New York City Omnibus	85.3		
Commercial Credit	104.7	Norfolk & Western	21.0		
Commercial Investment Trust	79.8	Northern Pacific	161.0		
Commonwealth & Southern preferred	113.0	Oliver Farm Equipment	126.5		
Consolidated Edison	64.8	Otis Elevator	54.4		
Consolidated Edison, preferred	25.6	Outboard M. & M.	77.7		
Consolidated Oil	94.7	Owens Illinois Glass	38.2		
Continental Insurance	45.9	Pacific Gas & Electric	71.0		
Continental Oil	85.3	Pacific Lighting	72.2		
Corn Exchange	71.5	Pacific Telephone	34.5		
Corn Products	36.7	Pan American Airways	137.1		
Cream Wheat	85.0	Paramount Pictures	90.4		
Crucible Steel	46.8	Parke-Davis	50.0		
Curtiss Wright	49.0	Patino Mines	88.8		
Curtiss Wright A.	34.0	Penick & Ford	35.2		
Douglas Aircraft	26.5	J. C. Penney	48.2		
Dow Chemical	41.6	Pennsylvania Railroad	57.6		
Dupont	39.1	Pepsi-Cola	172.1		
Eaton Manufacturing	51.0	Pet Milk	24.7		
Electric Autolite	67.3	Phelps Dodge	17.1		
Electric Power & Light, \$6 preferred	173.1	Phillip Morris	37.4		
Electric Power & Light, \$7 preferred	163.6	Phillips Petroleum	60.0		
Erie Railroad	161.6	Pillsbury Flour	43.5		
Firestone Tire & Rubber	127.0	Postal Telegraph, preferred	115.9		
Flintkote	105.2	Procter & Gamble	31.0		
Food Machinery	70.2	Pullman	62.0		
Gamewell	50.0	Radio, preferred	35.0		
General Electric	65.1	Reynolds Tobacco B.	36.2		
General Foods	59.4	Safeway Stores	26.3		
General Motors	61.2	St. Joseph Lead	48.9		
General Railway Signal	73.8	Schenley	115.7		
B. F. Goodrich	164.3	Scott Paper	57.9		
Goodrich, preferred	65.1	Seaboard Oil	89.2		
Goodyear Tire & Rubber	220.0	Sears, Roebuck	49.6		
Goodyear Tire & Rubber, preferred	62.2	Servel	195.0		
Great Northern Ry., preferred	44.9	Sharp & Dohme	177.0		
Greyhound	48.8	Shell Union Oil	109.9		
Gulf M. & O., preferred	89.6	Socony Vacuum	98.0		
Hazel Atlas Glass	27.0	Southern California Edison	54.6		
Holland Furnace	131.5	Southern Pacific	107.5		
Homestake Mining	50.0	Southern Railway	66.0		
Houdaille Hershey	44.0	Sperry Corporation	60.0		
Howe Sound	24.3	Square D Co.	35.4		
Inland Steel	33.3	Standard Oil of California	87.5		
International Business Machine	41.0	Standard Oil of Indiana	58.8		
International Harvester	62.5	Standard Oil of New Jersey	63.5		
International Mercantile Marine	136.3	Sterling Products	51.8		
International Mineral & Chemical	350.0	Sun Oil	40.7		
International Nickel	40.9	Swift Int.	68.1		
International Telephone	383.0	Texas Corporation	57.5		
Johns Manville	58.5	Texas Gulf Sulphur	37.9		
Kalamazoo Stove	180.0	Thompson Products	71.2		
Kayser Jr.	105.5	Timken Roller Bearing	48.8		
Kennecott	24.6	Twentieth Century-Fox Films	152.9		
Laclede Gas Pfd.	102.1	Twin City Rapid Transit	254.0		
Lambert Co.	84.8	Twir City Rapid Transit preferred	232.0		
Lee Rubber & Tire	112.0	Underwood Ell.	68.5		
Lehn & Fink	45.0	Union Carbide	41.2		
Lerner Stores	69.5	Union Oil of California	87.5		
Libby-O-F Glass	76.8	United Air Lines	147.7		
Lilly Tulip Cup	46.2	Unita Aircraft	44.0		
Lion Oil Ref.	66.2	United Biscuit	84.8		
Liquid Carbonic	62.6	United Drug	102.8		
Lockheed Aircraft	63.3	United Fruit	33.0		
Loews Inc.	34.8	United States Freight	154.0		
Lone Star Cement	41.3	United States Gypsum	65.1		
Lorillard, P.	60.8	United States Industrial Alcohol	39.3		
Louisville & Nashville	27.0	United States Leather A.	142.9		
Mack Truck	20.5	United States Plywood	80.0		

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, inasmuch as the motion before the Senate is to refer the bill and the veto message thereon to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, where the whole subject matter may receive further study, and where the bill in its original form and the veto message may be further considered and perhaps reported to the Senate at some opportune time, I shall vote for the motion.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to go into the merits of the controversy because it has been fully debated for the past 2 days. However, since I addressed the Senate the situation has changed. We are now approaching a vote on the motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I hope to consume not more than 10 minutes. I think we shall then be ready to vote. I know that Senators are anxious to vote.

When the price-control bill was before us for consideration one of the most controversial issues, as all Members of the Senate will recall, was what was known as the Thomas amendment, which provided that the increased cost of farm labor should be added to the parity prices.

The House approved that proposition. The Senate approved it in a different form, and the conference committee included it in the bill in the form in which it reported it, adopting an amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who is always devoted to the cause of the farmers, and who is always faithful and attentive when their interests are involved.

The amendment which went into the bill in conference provided that in fixing price maximums for agricultural commodities and for commodities processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, as provided for by the act, adequate weighing should be given to farm labor. That is the law, Mr. President, although we have not heard anything about it since it was enacted.

Instead of adding the labor costs, as Congress directed, which we all understood would result in some increases in agricultural prices, we find a movement to bring down prices and let them be supplemented by subsidy payments. I wish to invite the attention of the Senate and of the administrators of the law to that solemn declaration in the act, which was not inadvertently included,

but was included after much debate and thorough consideration by both Houses and the conference committee.

I should also like to invite the attention of the majority leader, in a friendly way, and not in any controversial spirit, to another factor in the introduction of the bill. The only order made by the President which resulted in the introduction of the bill required all agencies of the Government to deduct parity payments and soil conservation payments, which Congress had expressly declined to do, as well as all subsidies.

Mr. President, even if Congress should entertain a subsidy program and appropriate the money, what farmer would take a subsidy if it were to be charged against him—put into one pocket and taken out of the other?

The order provided that all subsidies should be deducted. Certainly parity payments, incentive payments, bonuses, and bounties are subsidies. Everything added to the income which does not come from the market, but is added by the Government, is a subsidy, notwithstanding the fact that that word has become odious and an effort is now being made to sugar-coat it by calling it an incentive payment. The result is the same.

There has been considerable discussion with relation to subsidy payments. I am not as firm on that subject as is the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. I shall not take the time to go into a discussion of the question. I want the farmer to get his money in the market place, which is the proper place for him to get it. I do not want to require him to take up his time making out a lot of papers, or to have a great force of Government field agents checking the information received from him. If the market conditions, the supply and demand conditions, justify it, it is sound and just, and more satisfactory to the farmer to get his price in the market place rather than to come to the Government and ask for a check to make up the difference.

We cannot adopt a bonus, or subsidy, or incentive payment system under the order we are trying to repeal. I am calling attention to it in a friendly way because I am not so vigorously opposed to it if we can hold the prices down. I am not so strongly in favor of it. I merely mention it to show the majority leader the trouble we are drawn into today by the Executive order, in legislating on any program which seeks to change the present price situation. It has been called an incentive payment. Who will argue about it? Who will argue that under this order it must not be deducted from the parity price, or from the ceiling? Every amount which is paid in the form of a subsidy, as an incentive payment, for peanuts, potatoes, or anything else, under this order must be deducted from the parity price, and thereby bring down lower and lower the market and parity price, and especially the ceiling price.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say on the merits of this matter. In view of the variation between my information and that of the Senator from Kentucky

about the number of non-cooperators among the farmers, I wish to put into the RECORD a statement showing that the number of farmers receiving soil-conservation payments is 5,956,206. The information of the Senator from Kentucky was that there were only 38 percent, I believe, not receiving benefit payments, and not participating in the soil-conservation program. It will be found that farmers all over the country are co-operating and participating in the receipt of soil-conservation payments.

The number of farmers receiving parity payments is 5,696,930. I have a list showing commodities participating in the receipt of soil-conservation payments, and the amount received for each of these commodities in 1941. I ask unanimous consent that the list be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In 1941 the following commodities received soil-conservation payments (including soil building):

Number of farms receiving payments on these commodities not available: Cotton, corn, wheat, Irish potatoes, peanuts, rice, flue-cured tobacco, burley tobacco, all other tobacco, celery, commercial vegetables, general soil-depleting crops.

Number of farms receiving soil-conservation payments, 5,956,206.

In 1941 the following commodities received parity payments:

Cotton	2,553,703
Corn	1,196,094
Wheat	1,576,977
Rice	12,336
Flue-cured tobacco	274,361
Fire-cured tobacco	46,980
Other tobacco	36,487

Number of farms receiving parity payments..... 5,696,930

Figures not yet available for 1942 because they are still making 1942 payments.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The source of the information which I have just asked to be printed in the RECORD is the statistical summary of 1941, Agricultural Service and Payment Program, November 1942, compiled in the Division of Special Programs of the triple A from the reports of county, State, and regional triple A offices.

Mr. President, in conclusion I will say that I have heretofore stated that the bill about which we have been debating is here as a farmers' bill. It is not my bill, nor the bill of any other individual. The farmers, through their organizations, were disturbed by the Executive order which upset and changed the farm program outlined in the price-control law. They had been in Washington and fought these issues, and had adjusted themselves to the law as it was passed by Congress and approved by the President. The President's Executive order was then issued, and it upset and changed the program. In the interest of fairness and in justice to them, the farmers thought that the views adopted by Congress and approved by the President did not need any Executive order changing them, and that they ought to

stand as the Congress, after considerable debate, had adopted them. Through their organizations the farmers brought the bill to me. I introduced it, and Senators know the remainder of its history.

When it developed yesterday that the supporters of the bill would probably be unable to muster the necessary two-thirds vote to pass the bill over the President's veto, the question then arose as to what should be done. Everyone knew that there were varying opinions concerning the facts. Everyone knew that sets of figures were being presented; even the President said so in his message. Some indicated that large amounts of money were involved, and more or less inflation. But even the President himself was unable to make up his mind and state the specific facts to Congress. The whole issue was beclouded, and we all know that extraneous factors have entered the minds of Senators in their consideration of what they should do under all the circumstances. So it was decided that the bill and the message ought to be referred to the committee, in the interest of justice, in the interest of decent and fair legislation, in the interest of historical accuracy, in view of statements being presented here from high official sources which were totally challenged, which stand challenged today, and which were challenged yesterday. They may be right, they may be wrong; I shall not go into that argument now. There are great and fundamental variations in the information given to the Senate and in the constructions placed on certain facts which have been presented, so far as the inflationary effect is concerned.

Some Senators seem to think that a few cents increase in the prices paid to farmers for a few agricultural commodities would be greatly inflationary. Some say that the only inflationary factor of great importance—and I agree with them—is the amount of money in the pockets of the people so greatly in excess of the quantity of the goods which are available. That is the great factor which threatens inflation. But these questions are all involved. Men in high authority do not even agree on what constitutes inflation, and what factors are inflationary.

In justice to the farm group, let me say that they do not bring many requests to Congress for legislation. They are usually content to accept what comes to them, with humility, patriotism, and loyalty. This program was brought before five big farm organizations. As I have pointed out, in recent history they have not agreed on anything else. They agreed on this program, not because it involved any large increase in the farmer's income. As we all knew, it involved more the source of their income than it did the amount they were to receive. But they thought it was unfair and unjust. In justice to them, in justice to Senators who will vote to recommit this bill, and who would gladly vote to override the President's veto, the farm organizations to which I have referred—and I am speaking for them by their authority—would like to have the bill sent to

the committee, in view of the controversies involving not only principles, but important facts, all of which have been developed, most of which have been developed since the bill was vetoed and returned to the Senate. What harm could result from such action? In the first place, we are not on the verge of any runaway inflation which will take place overnight, as some people thought when we undertook last October to change the price-control law.

Permit me to read one statement from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics which will probably surprise a great many people who are almost ready to cry over the inflation now in effect. Inflation may come; I do not know. God knows I pray that it may not. But it does not hurt anyone to know the facts. During the past winter there were probably outrageous increases on the part of retailers in the prices of seasonal vegetables. There were severe freezes in the South which destroyed many of the vegetables and fruits which are shipped to the northern sections of the country at this time of the year. This condition probably resulted in an undue and unnecessary rise in the prices of certain commodities which go to the consumer's table.

What I wish to read is from the official issue of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics on agricultural prices, a bulletin issued once every month, and distributed widely. Let me read the first few sentences:

The general level of prices received by farmers in mid-March was 182 percent of the 1914-19 average, the United States Department of Agriculture reported today. An advance of 4 points from February 15 wiped out a decrease of 4 points during the previous month and restored the index to the level reached on January 15.

We are right now where we were on January 15, according to the official declaration of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and but for the rise in price, as they state here, as a result of the increase in the price of meat, there would have been a decrease in the last 2 months instead of wild inflation, as some people seem to think is now prevalent.

These are the official records. Inflation may come, I do not know, but there is no harm in sending the bill back to the committee and letting the facts be developed. I am sure that no one is afraid of having the facts developed. I do not think anyone will vote against sending the bill back on that account.

Some may think they have the farmer where he cannot get out because he cannot get a two-thirds vote here at this time, and he may never be able to get a two-thirds vote. But a new issue is presented by the veto. The situation is different now, there are different facts presented.

Mr. President, I have made a motion to refer the bill to the committee, so that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may explore the whole field, bring the statisticians and economists before it, and do the best the committee—which is a good committee—can do to get the real truth of the situation. If the com-

mittee shall decide the bill should be reconsidered by the Senate, the committee can bring the bill back. I am sure there will be no hurry about it, and that the committee's conclusion will be judicially arrived at. If the committee shall decide the bill does not deserve further consideration, of course, it will not bring the bill back to the Senate.

Mr. President, I think we should have a record vote on the motion, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Radcliffe
Austin	Guffey	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hatch	Reynolds
Barkley	Hawkes	Robertson
Bone	Hayden	Russell
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Bridges	Holman	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lodge	Truman
Chandler	Lucas	Tunnell
Chavez	McCarran	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Van Nuys
Connally	McKellar	Wagner
Danaher	McNary	Wallgren
Davis	Maloney	Walsh
Downey	Mead	Wheeler
Eastland	Millikin	Wherry
Ellender	Moore	White
Ferguson	Murdock	Wiley
George	Nye	Willis
Gerry	O'Daniel	Wilson
Gillette	O'Mahoney	
	Overton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] to refer Senate bill 660, with the accompanying veto message, to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have a pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY]. I am advised that if present the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea." I vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent on an inspection tour of military camps.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent, holding hearings in the West on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate Small Business Enterprises.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] has been called out of the city on important public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Florida would vote "yea" and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] if present would vote "nay." I am advised that if present the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness. He is paired on this question with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO]. If present the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay" and I am advised the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is absent on official business as a member of the Small Business Committee of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—62

Aiken	Hayden	Revercomb
Austin	Hill	Reynolds
Ball	Holman	Robertson
Bankhead	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bone	La Follette	Shipstead
Brewster	Langer	Smith
Brooks	Lucas	Stewart
Bushfield	McCarran	Taft
Butler	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Vandenberg
Connally	Moore	Van Nuys
Downey	Murdock	Wallgren
Eastland	Nye	Wheeler
Ellender	O'Daniel	Wherry
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Wiley
George	Overton	Willis
Gillette	Radcliffe	Wilson
Hawkes	Reed	

NAYS—23

Bailey	Gerry	Maloney
Barkley	Green	Mead
Bridges	Guffey	Truman
Burton	Gurney	Tunnell
Chandler	Hatch	Wagner
Chavez	Johnson, Calif.	Walsh
Danaher	Kilgore	White
Davis	Lodge	

NOT VOTING—11

Andrews	Caraway	Pepper
Barbour	Glass	Scrugham
Bilbo	Maybank	Tobey
Buck	Murray	

So, Senate bill 660, with the accompanying veto message, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SUPPLY AND DISTRIBUTION OF FARM LABOR

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider House Joint Resolution 96, Calendar No. 158.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I understand it is not the desire of the Senator from Georgia to proceed with the measure today?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no intention of proceeding with the joint resolution today, but should like to have it made the unfinished business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The title of the joint resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to inform the Senate that on completion of the consideration of House Joint Resolution 96 tomorrow, which I believe will take only a few minutes, it is the intention to take up the Federal pay bill which is on the calendar, Senate bill 635. Probably a House bill will be substituted for the Senate bill, but that will be the subject matter for consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with an amendment.

INSTRUCTION IN AMERICAN HISTORY

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] submitted a resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, in regard to the subject of history teaching in the United States public schools. This morning's New York Times contained a summary of comment among educators concerning this question. The lead of the story begins:

Praising the New York Times survey of college freshman knowledge of United States history as a "real service to education," prominent educators joined yesterday in urging that the subject be given greater stress both in high school and in college.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be incorporated in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATORS PRAISE UNITED STATES HISTORY TEST—NEW YORK TIMES SURVEY TERMED A "REAL SERVICE"—BLAME FOR IGNORANCE ANALYZED—POOR TEACHING CHARGED—OTHER PROBABLE CAUSES GIVEN AS HEAVY SCHEDULES, DISLIKE OF "ANNOYING FACTS"

Praising the New York Times survey of college freshman knowledge of United States history as a "real service to education," prominent educators joined yesterday in urging that the subject be given greater stress both in high school and in college. A charge was made that many teachers are doing a "poor job" in this field and were allowing students to "get by" with a minimum of effort.

In the study, made public Sunday, it was found that a majority of college freshmen

have little knowledge about important historical events or figures connected with the United States. Seven thousand freshmen, in 36 representative colleges and universities, were examined.

Commenting on the survey, Dean William F. Russell of Teachers College, Columbia University, declared that the New York Times "has done a real service in calling to our attention the need for knowledge of American history." He remarked that at present we know "too little of it" but need to know much more.

CONDITION IS ANALYZED

"I am confident that the issue is not whether ignorance of American history is the result of the practice of teaching history, geography, economics, and civics in close relation to each other under such a title as social studies or of following the older procedure of teaching each subject separately," Dean Russell said.

Teachers College has had professors advocating each plan. Prof. Henry Johnson believed in the subject approach. Lincoln School has followed the social-studies plan.

"The real cause of our ignorance, not only in history, but of science and other fields, can be found in our short school year, our plan of four subjects taught five times a week in high school (with English, foreign language, and mathematics taking the bulk of the time), the poor pay of our teachers so that they cannot afford adequate post-graduate training, the large size of classes, and the excessive proportion of pupils taking academic rather than vocational classes.

"I am confident that if we should follow the plan of the progressive school where there is a core curriculum occupying about half of the time, devoted to the sciences, history, economics, geography, civics, and personal health and welfare; when this is required of every pupil every year; when this is taught by well-educated teachers, then the products of our schools will know enough to be good citizens."

SEES SERVICE DONE

Asserting that ignorance of the Nation's growth, institutions, and traditions is "dangerous from the point of view of the development of democracy," Prof. Robert G. Caldwell, dean of humanities, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, declared that the Times' survey has "rendered a real service to American education."

Dean Caldwell placed the blame for students' lack of knowledge of American history on the teachers of the subject. In secondary schools, he said, a "poor job" of teaching can be found which allows youth to get by in the course with a minimum of effort. He charged that colleges have not all set as high standards in their history requirements as they have in mathematics and other sciences.

"The colleges and universities, yes, and the American people," he added, "are slipping in their standards. As a matter of fact, there are some that do not care for history. High schools can improve the teaching of American history by cutting down on wasted motion."

To remedy the existing situation which the Times disclosed, Dean Caldwell recommended higher standards for teachers and higher standards of accomplishments. Commenting on the questionnaire, Dean Caldwell asserted that "as a whole most questions were well chosen."

"The general impression one may gather from the survey is that American high-school youth has enough courses in history but that the students have not been held up in standards as they have in the fields of science.

"We can remedy the situation by getting better teachers with higher standards and by having the colleges adopt higher standards. I do not believe that we need any legislation

for making our students more history conscious."

Observing that he was "not in the least surprised" by the results of the Times survey, Dean Alexander Baltzly, acting chairman of the history department at New York University's Washington Square College, predicted that a survey of students' knowledge of English or of any other subject would have the same results. His own students, who are largely graduates of the New York City school system, "are as bad as the rest," he said.

"In our schools there is an evident disrespect for 'annoying' facts on the part of the faculty, the curriculum makers, and the students," Dean Baltzly said. "It's so much easier to talk about a nice, long-term trend. Indeed it's an axiom in educational circles that college students are unable to read, write, or figure and that they are ignorant of geography. Of course, these students would be better prepared if high schools would eliminate the fancy stuff and teach those four skills.

"Our educational system is based on the premise that the student will read at home and will acquire some fund of knowledge independently. This is not the case, however, for many students come from homes where they do not learn the fundamentals. Why, I spend most of my time looking for English mistakes in my students' papers."

SUBJECT HELD UNSTYLISH

Dr. Andre A. Beaumont, Jr., associate professor of history at New York University, declared that the results of the survey have confirmed him in his belief that United States history has become an "unstylish" subject.

"The blame for the students' poor showing in the Times survey should be laid on the curriculum planners," Dr. Beaumont said. "Good, sound courses in American history are rare in our high schools. I do not think that the subsidiary school sciences are of much value without a sound background of political history, and I do not believe that the average high school history course could have prepared students for answering questions such as those asked on the Times questionnaire."

Revision of high school curriculums should be the first step taken to correct students' ignorance of our history, according to Dr. Beaumont. He declared that "then, when they have acquired this framework of knowledge, it will be time enough to teach them the subsidiary social sciences."

Disagreeing with Dr. Beaumont's interpretation of the survey, Prof. Clyde Eagleton of the government department at New York University, said that "students have had enough history to understand our traditions." He added that he had no use for the idea that students must be taught, in great detail, the lives and works of all the great men of the past.

"On the contrary," he held, "courses in American history should contain a lot more civics to prepare the student to become an intelligent voter. If anything, we need to put more emphasis on contemporary problems."

PRAISES AROUSING OF PUBLIC

"The New York Times has made a real contribution in arousing the public to the existing urgent need for more attention to United States history," Jacob I. Hartstein, assistant professor of education at Long Island University and Yeshiva College, declared. "Educators generally," he said, "must pay more attention to the methods and materials which contribute to a development of an appreciation of our democracy."

"This can be developed through an intimate acquaintance of our Nation's inspiring past," Professor Hartstein asserted. "This need has

never been greater nor the time more appropriate."

"American history should be taught with the idea of making the youth of the country more world-minded," Prof. Nelson P. Mead, chairman of the history department at City College, declared. He pointed out that "even the most rabid isolationist must admit today that this country is destined to play a significant if not determining role in world-wide problems at the close of this war."

"A narrow nationalistic study of American history is not likely to prepare young men and women to play an intelligent part in helping to solve the serious problems which will confront the country when the war is over," Dr. Mead said.

According to Dr. Mead, American youth must become familiar with the history of the United States relations with the rest of the world if a lasting peace is to be concluded. He recalled that before the First World War the American people were abysmally ignorant concerning international relations and that our refusal to join the League of Nations was a natural result of this lack of information.

Dr. Mead condemned the high schools for their tendency to dilute American history by teaching mainly general concepts and underemphasizing familiarity with factual material. He said that only in the most recent textbooks has adequate consideration been given to the past and present relations of the United States with the rest of the world.

The findings of the Times survey merits the serious consideration of American high-school teachers, Dr. Alonzo F. Myers, chairman of the higher education department of New York University, declared. It would appear evident, he said, that some high schools have given inadequate time to this subject and that some of the teachers have been inadequately prepared to teach history.

"The findings of this survey certainly provide excellent justification for greater attention to American history in our colleges," Professor Myers said. "Furthermore, they appear to provide an argument for much greater attention to the social sciences in connection with the Army and Navy program for the 18- and 19-year-old youths who are to be sent back to college."

ROOM SEEN FOR IMPROVEMENT

Although the conditions of secondary school education in American history may not be as bad as the figures brought out by The Times survey, there is certainly room for improvement, Dean Virginia C. Gildersleeve of Barnard College observed yesterday to an all-college assembly. Students who do not know that Abraham Lincoln was President of the United States during the Civil War are hardly material for thoughtful and wise citizens, she said.

The survey, she continued, indicates some great lack in secondary school education, a foginess on the part of high school graduates concerning facts which are fundamental to every American's education. However, this lack of knowledge is not applicable only to American history, she indicated, but to mathematics, foreign languages, or English.

It is obvious, Dean Gildersleeve said, that although some of the secondary school training is excellent, it can and certainly must be improved. These students must learn to discipline their minds and to be accurate on at least certain essential facts, she held.

The East Orange Board of Education, following a discussion of the survey, has instructed Superintendent of Schools Henry Kentopp to call a conference of all school principals in the local system to determine means of providing more adequate teaching of United States history. The board asked that particular attention be paid to stressing

the subject in the two senior high schools in the city.

The conference will be called as soon as it can be arranged, Dr. Kentopp said. A special conference to consider the Times survey and its implications to education will be held under the auspices of Fairleigh Dickinson Junior College, Rutherford, N. J., on Monday afternoon, Dr. Peter Sammartino, president, announced. Prominent educators in New Jersey and outside of the State have been invited to participate.

In an editorial appearing yesterday, the Washington Post said that the New York Times' test revealing a great lack of knowledge of American history is disheartening, not so much because of the lack of factual knowledge displayed as because of the implied lack of grasp of the meaning of the great events of our history.

"If our students had received the right kind of instruction," the editorial said, "they would not have forgotten so speedily the accomplishments of our national leaders."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

The following-named officers for temporary appointment as brigadier generals in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law:

Col. Arthur Ringland Harris, Field Artillery; and

Col. Claude Mitchell Adams (lieutenant colonel), Army of the United States.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

John L. Thomas, to be postmaster at Bevier, Mo., in place of Ordeil Gross, removed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Clarence Mullins to be United States district judge for the northern district of Alabama.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edmund J. Brandon to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Irving J. Higbee to be United States attorney for the northern district of New York.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George Philip to be United States attorney for the district of South Dakota.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles W. Robertson to be United States marshal for the district of South Dakota.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Fannie Dixon Welch to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 6, with headquarters at Bridgeport, Conn.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that Calendar Nos. 677, 679, and 680 be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs. In that connection, I may say that the chairman of the committee has no objection.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, what are the nominations?

Mr. McCARRAN. They come under the heading "War Manpower Commission."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the other nominations in the War Manpower Commission be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the other nominations in the War Manpower Commission are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Osborne B. Hardison to be rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service.

Mr. WALSH. I move that the nomination be confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, April 8, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 7 (legislative day of April 6), 1943:

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Patrick Thomas Fagan, from the State of Pennsylvania, to be area director, at \$6,500 per annum, in the Pittsburgh area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Faber A. Bollinger, from the State of Georgia, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Leo Kogan, from the State of New York, to be field supervisor, at \$5,600 per annum, in the New York regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Bernard Sless, from the State of New York, to be senior occupational analyst, at \$4,600 per annum, in the New York regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Frances R. Gresham, Autaugaville, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Thomas Maxwell Karrh, Ferry, Ala., in place of T. M. Karrh, transferred.

Thomas W. Brock, Mulga, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Lucy P. Thomas, Section, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

James H. Dunlap, Siluria, Ala., in place of J. H. Dunlap. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

ARIZONA

Warren D. Judd, Fredonia, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

ARKANSAS

Walter D. Patton, Alma, Ark., in place of W. E. Bradley, transferred.

Verna P. Reitzammer, Arkansas City, Ark., in place of V. P. Reitzammer. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1942.

Etta C. Hendrix, Blevins, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Charlie N. Parker, Cotton Plant, Ark., in place of W. G. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John T. Sumner, McNeil, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

CALIFORNIA

Fred M. Taylor, Greenville, Calif., in place of J. M. Costar, retired.

Marvin S. Wick, Hermosa Beach, Calif., in place of M. S. Wick. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Dale K. Campbell, Mariposa, Calif., in place of M. I. Paine, retired.

Charles S. Catlin, Saticoy, Calif., in place of C. S. Catlin. Incumbent's commission expired May 27, 1942.

Alfred R. Montegani, Tiburon, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Charles E. Conner, Torrance, Calif., in place of C. E. Conner. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

COLORADO

C. Alton Beck, Aspen, Colo., in place of John Bowman, retired.

Bert O. Benson, Heeney, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Ada Killin, Kiowa, Colo., in place of B. C. Killin, deceased.

Mary Winifred Laube, Rico, Colo., in place of J. O. C. Lutener, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Catherine S. Barnett, Suffield, Conn., in place of C. S. Barnett. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Albert E. Lennox, Windsor, Conn., in place of A. E. Lennox. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

DELAWARE

Claborne A. Boothe, Frankford, Del., in place of C. A. Boothe. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Joseph C. Slack, Newport, Del., in place of J. C. Slack. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

FLORIDA

Arthur E. Woodburn, Marathon, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Hollis F. Anderson, Mayport, Fla. Office became Presidential April 1, 1942.

Cora L. Lott, Princeton, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

GEORGIA

Lamar S. Smith, Bartow, Ga., in place of A. S. Chamlee, deceased.

Hezzie McWhorter, Cochran, Ga., in place of J. A. Walker, deceased.

Nathan C. Wilkes, Lincolnton, Ga., in place of J. M. Wilkes, retired.

Aligene B. Howard, Ludowici, Ga., in place of A. B. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

W. Brantley Daniel, Millen, Ga., in place of W. B. Daniel. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Robert M. Causey, Tucker, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

IDAHO

Clellan W. Bentley, Mullan, Idaho, in place of C. W. Bentley. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

ILLINOIS

William E. Clark, Amboy, Ill., in place of J. A. Edwards, resigned.

Myrtle M. Hyland, Cherry Valley, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Blanche Linebarger, Elwood, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

George C. Guard, Equality, Ill., in place of I. B. Coyle. Incumbent's commission expired May 11, 1942.

Vernon F. Nixon, Lomax, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Charles H. Anderson, Mount Pulaski, Ill., in place of W. D. Wacaser, deceased.

Rudolph Mueller, Sherrard, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Melvin Higerson, West Frankfort, Ill., in place of Melvin Higerson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

INDIANA

Ora William Irwin, Attica, Ind., in place of Mary Williams. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Marshall Winslow, Greenfield, Ind., in place of Marshall Winslow. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1942.

Merton L. Hughbanks, Scottsburg, Ind., in place of M. L. Hughbanks. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Cash N. Essington, Spiceland, Ind., in place of D. M. Liggett, resigned.

Wayne S. Simms, Waveland, Ind., in place of William Simms, deceased.

Mildred M. Shinn, Whiteland, Ind., in place of R. N. Hearn, resigned.

IOWA

Kirby J. Smith, Burt, Iowa, in place of M. M. Hanna, deceased.

Pearle A. Mace, Merville, Iowa, in place of Mattie Neustrom, resigned.

Albert H. Gray, Sergeant Bluff, Iowa, in place of H. M. Michaelson, retired.

KANSAS

Irvin T. Hocker, Baxter Springs, Kans., in place of I. T. Hocker. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John K. States, Buffalo, Kans., in place of A. D. Spillman, transferred.

Frank M. Belding, Copeland, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Arch E. Hosmer, Holton, Kans., in place of A. E. Hosmer. Incumbent's commission expired May 29, 1938.

Katharine A. Blasing, Ogden, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Esta S. Riseley, Stockton, Kans., in place of E. S. Riseley. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William J. Dehler, Sylvan Grove, Kans., in place of W. E. Wohler, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Tarney M. Riddle, Pikeville, Ky., in place of George Pinson, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John H. Mitchell, Salem, Ky., in place of J. H. Mitchell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

LOUISIANA

John A. Moody, Cotton Valley, La., in place of J. A. Moody. Incumbent's commission expired December 7, 1941.

Winnie H. Arras, Gramercy, La., in place of W. H. Arras. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Azalee W. Nelson, Haughton, La., in place of A. W. Nelson. Incumbent's commission expired December 7, 1941.

Van J. Harry, New Iberia, La., in place of Silvio Broussard, retired.

Rosa V. Shipes, St. Francisville, La., in place of R. V. Shipes. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

Andrew C. Burns, Shongalco, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Elias C. Leone, Zwolle, La., in place of E. C. Leone. Incumbent's commission expired April 29, 1942.

MAINE

Nelson A. Harnden, Belgrade Lakes, Maine, in place of N. A. Harnden. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Afton H. Farrin, South Bristol, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Lucy H. Bromley, South Windham, Maine, in place of C. A. Magnusson, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS

John E. Harrington, North Chelmsford, Mass., in place of J. E. Harrington. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Helen R. Erikson, Pembroke, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

MICHIGAN

Walter J. Grace, Carson City, Mich., in place of W. J. Grace. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Helen M. Kucera, Cedar, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Clara E. Burnett, Dimondale, Mich., in place of J. R. Burnett, deceased.

Bernice S. Tiedeman, Washington, Mich., in place of J. L. Whitney, retired.

MINNESOTA

Howard H. Gunz, Center City, Minn., in place of H. H. Gunz. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1942.

Henry A. C. Saggau, Ceylon, Minn., in place of H. A. C. Saggau. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Albert O. McEachern, Delano, Minn., in place of A. O. McEachern. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Dagny G. Sundahl, Grove City, Minn., in place of D. G. Sundahl. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1942.

Earl Stanton, Hayfield, Minn., in place of Earl Stanton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charles Smith, Lake Wilson, Minn., in place of R. B. Forrest, retired.

Joseph G. Bauer, Madison, Minn., in place of J. G. Bauer. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1942.

Carl C. Heibel, Northfield, Minn., in place of C. C. Heibel. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1942.

John M. Lannon, Prior Lake, Minn., in place of J. M. Lannon. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1941.

Hjalmer A. Johnson, Soudan, Minn., in place of H. A. Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

MISSISSIPPI

J. Truett Carr, Heidelberg, Miss., in place of P. H. Morrison, retired.

Oscar T. Davis, Ocean Springs, Miss., in place of L. M. McClure, deceased.

Rebecca B. Quinn, Prentiss, Miss., in place of V. B. Duckworth, retired.

Herbert A. Robertson, Sallis, Miss., in place of D. E. Morgan, transferred.

James F. Howry, Sardis, Miss., in place of J. F. Howry. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hermine D. Lamar, Senatobia, Miss., in place of H. D. Lamar. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Myrtle D. Baker, Wiggins, Miss., in place of Buren Broadus, deceased.

MISSOURI

Frances F. Klughart, Fornielt, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Francis E. Patterson, Koch, Mo., in place of M. E. Gardner, resigned.

Joseph J. Nacke, Meta, Mo., in place of L. C. Sheekelsworth, deceased.

MONTANA

George T. Farrell, Polson, Mont., in place of G. T. Farrell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEBRASKA

Darwin T. Murfin, Cairo, Nebr., in place of H. R. Boesen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NEVADA

Donald S. Shaver, Ely, Nev., in place of Alfred Tamblin, resigned.

Imogene West Van Camp, Ruth, Nev., in place of Zoe Kenyon, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Margaret M. Hildreth, Bethlehem, N. H., in place of R. T. Hildreth, resigned.

Florence G. Taylor, West Swanzey, N. H., in place of W. F. Hanrahan, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Rose B. Sokolowski, Alpha, N. J., in place of R. B. Sokolowski. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Philip L. Fellingner, East Orange, N. J., in place of P. L. Fellingner. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mildred Mullen, Oceanport, N. J., in place of W. I. Gaul, removed.

Theresa O'Farrell Wood, West Long Branch, N. J., in place of Roy Bowman, resigned.

NEW YORK

David L. Churcher, Big Flats, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

George T. Morgan, Cocksackie, N. Y., in place of G. M. Lamb, deceased.

Raymond C. Nellis, Hastings, N. Y., in place of R. C. Nellis. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

NORTH CAROLINA

Bertha B. McCurry, Bostic, N. C., in place of J. M. Rollins, transferred.

Theron C. Dellinger, Crossnore, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Joshua T. Winstead, Macclesfield, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Ethel B. Casper, New London, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Wilbur A. Pike, Pikeville, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Ralph E. Martin, Ronda, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

NORTH DAKOTA

Marie A. Hanson, Aneta, N. Dak., in place of L. A. Hanson, resigned.

Mary T. Huber, Fingal, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

OHIO

Claude S. Coyle, Batavia, Ohio, in place of C. S. Coyle. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Eva M. Tipton, Bloomingdale, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Grace G. Copeland, Bristolville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Jessie K. Dilworth, Cortland, Ohio, in place of J. K. Dilworth. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Daniel L. Pokey, Lakeside, Ohio, in place of D. L. Pokey. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Susan M. Ramsey, Loveland, Ohio, in place of S. M. Ramsey. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William Ransom Shaw, McDermott, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Urban B. Menker, Maria Stein, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Daniel P. Miller, Montgomery, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Ira Q. Rhoten, Mowrystown, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Jean E. Holden, Pierpont, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Clara B. Dix, Prospect, Ohio, in place of C. B. Dix. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

OKLAHOMA

Oscar E. Bailey, Calvin, Okla., in place of O. M. Morse, deceased.

James Jones Quarles, Jr., Fairfax, Okla., in place of J. J. Quarles, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

OREGON

Millard W. Grubb, Ashland, Oreg., in place of J. H. Fuller. Incumbent's commission expired March 12, 1940.

Antoinette T. McKechnie, Gearhart, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

PENNSYLVANIA

John B. Newhart, Alderson, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

J. Arthur Walter, Claysburg, Pa., in place of Grace Brubaker, resigned.

Wilmer F. Sowers, Green Lane, Pa., in place of W. F. Sowers. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Wilmer S. Knipe, Horsham, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Edwin W. Henry, Jr., Hulmeville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Nora J. Brendlinger, New Florence, Pa., in place of S. S. Ulerich, retired.

James W. Hatch, North Girard, Pa., in place of J. W. Hatch. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Peter Renaldo, Roseto, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Milton E. Spahr, Shepherdstown, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Wave L. Blakeslee, Spartansburg, Pa., in place of H. B. Wallace, resigned.

George D. Arner, Weissport, Pa., in place of G. D. Arner. Incumbent's commission expired June 6, 1942.

RHODE ISLAND

Irvin D. Follett, Howard, R. I., in place of W. H. Follett, retired.

Cecil A. R. Hopkins, Hoxsie, R. I. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

SAMOA

David J. McMullin, Pago Pago, Samoa, in place of D. J. McMullin. Incumbent's commission expired May 25, 1942.

SOUTH CAROLINA

William T. Hemingway, Hemingway, S. C., in place of W. T. Hemingway. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Blanche B. Hudson, Ruffin, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Theresa W. DeBilzan, Andover, S. Dak., in place of Nicholas DeBilzan, deceased.

Albert E. Kostboth, Canistota, S. Dak., in place of W. C. Clark, resigned.

Josephine C. Eggerling, Orient, S. Dak., in place of J. C. Eggerling. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Thomas L. Dam, Rosebud, S. Dak., in place of A. H. Manion, resigned.

Kathryn M. McCoy, Tulare, S. Dak., in place of K. M. McCoy. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

TENNESSEE

Vola W. Mansfield, Dunlap, Tenn., in place of V. W. Mansfield. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William P. Stone, Lynchburg, Tenn., in place of W. P. Stone. Incumbent's commission expired June 10, 1942.

Lois Caruthers, Whiteville, Tenn., in place of G. H. Rhodes, removed without prejudice.

TEXAS

Hugh L. Williams, Blanket, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Horace Hamilton, Franklin, Tex., in place of R. B. Truett, transferred.

Clyde E. Perkins, Kirkland, Tex., in place of C. E. Perkins. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Grace L. Fowler, Pflugerville, Tex., in place of B. H. Larsen. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1942.

Charles G. Conley, Quanah, Tex., in place of C. G. Conley. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

UTAH

Pearl Wilcox, Clearfield, Utah. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Richard F. Lambert, Jr., Kamas, Utah, in place of G. T. Williams, resigned.

VERMONT

Ward L. Lyons, Bennington, Vt., in place of W. L. Lyons. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Kenneth A. Tudhope, North Hero, Vt., in place of K. A. Tudhope. Incumbent's commission expired May 4, 1942.

John J. Cain, Orwell, Vt., in place of J. J. Cain. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Patrick J. Candon, Pittsford, Vt., in place of P. J. Candon. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mary E. Gover, Sheldon Springs, Vt., in place of H. E. Whiting, resigned.

VIRGINIA

Claude B. Nolen, Ferrum, Va., in place of C. B. Nolen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Edgar S. Moore, Stafford, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

WASHINGTON

William E. Jones, Houghton, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Nikolai K. Nelson, Keyport, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Loraine A. Schuit, Reardan, Wash., in place of W. H. Padley, retired.

Lena A. Vorels, Richmond Beach, Wash., in place of Frank Williams, removed without prejudice.

Robert I. Matheson, Suquamish, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Harry M. Bona, Tillicum, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Fairleigh B. Wilkins, Yakima, Wash., in place of F. B. Wilkins. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

WEST VIRGINIA

Stella M. Krevosky, Grant Town, W. Va., in place of E. J. Rush, resigned.

Jeremiah W. Dingess, Huntington, W. Va., in place of J. W. Dingess. Incumbent's commission expired March 7, 1942.

WISCONSIN

Dominic W. Riley, Baldwin, Wis., in place of D. W. Riley. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Bernard G. Schrammske, Boyceville, Wis., in place of B. G. Schrammske. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Shirley C. Harrison, Cottage Grove, Wis., in place of R. M. Graves, retired.

Lola M. Meyer, Dane, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Alfred P. Schwalbach, Germantown, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1939.

Wenzel M. Dvorak, La Crosse, Wis., in place of W. M. Dvorak. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1942.

Joseph F. Kaminski, Lake Delton, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Raymond J. Voemastek, Rib Lake, Wis., in place of J. J. Voemastek, retired.

Stephen J. McShane, Rice Lake, Wis., in place of S. J. McShane. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

Katharine G. Lynch, Sullivan, Wis., in place of A. M. Clinton, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 7 (legislative day of April 6), 1943.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Clarence Mullins to be United States district judge for the northern district of Alabama.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Edmund J. Brandon to be United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts.

Irving J. Higbee to be United States attorney for the northern district of New York.

George Philip to be United States attorney for the district of South Dakota.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Charles W. Robertson to be United States marshal for the district of South Dakota.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Fannie Dixon Welch to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 6, with headquarters at Bridgeport, Conn.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Alexander C. Martin, Jr., to be principal manpower utilization consultant, at \$5,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office.

Walter L. Sundstrom to be senior training specialist, at \$4,800 per annum, in the Seattle area office.

William Royle, of Nevada, to be area director for Nevada, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Reno area office.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Osborne B. Hardison, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from November 29, 1942.

POSTMASTERS

LOUISIANA

Maurice Primeaux, Kaplan.
Leo L. Ehrhardt, Simmesport.

MICHIGAN

Simon F. Blake, Bellaire.
Helen E. Daly, Carrollton.
LaVange M. Taggart, Cement City.
Marian A. Cleary, Clawson.
Mary Elliott, Haslett.
Helen B. Martin, Indian River.
Nellie I. Blemaster, Maple Rapids.
Margaret C. Cryan, Mendon.
Anna C. Kulish, Minden City.
Bert F. Taylor, North Adams.
Hallie C. Bunting, Port Hope.
Elizabeth J. Shannon, Powers.

OKLAHOMA

Gladys M. Walker, Choctaw.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 7, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, the Reverend James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and eternal Spirit, who at the creation looked on all Thy works and called them good, sound Thy trumpet over this sorrowing world until its pain shall be assuaged and all hearts turned to Thy holy will. Assailed by battle hosts and falsehood's crafty crews, O preserve our land from all evil fates and prosper her in all things worthy and guard our banner of the free.

O Son of the living God, save our country from the scorch of irreverence, irreligion, and moral decadence. Kindle in all breasts the warmth of persistent courage, by whose inspiration great difficulties are overcome and great tasks accomplished. Whatever there may be of confusion and doubt, guide us through these conflicting paths and strengthen us with earnest will, declaring the truth in love and power. O break up the bulwarks of egotism, selfishness, and intolerance which invade the soul and allow not the strife of the world to mirror our unrealities. With reason firm and temperate will, help us to leaven other lives, widening the circle until peace and unity are brought to mankind. Endow us with a set purpose to greet each duty with wise decision and thereby justify our cause, realizing that no earthly affluence can atone for labor neglected and unperformed. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Duke, one of its clerks, announced that the Acting President pro tempore had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition

of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. The National Archives.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Department of War.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Appropriations I present a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1648) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. Norton addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

HARD OF HEARING AND THE DEAF—DIGEST OF STATE LAWS AFFECTING THE HARD OF HEARING AND THE DEAF

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 348) back favorably, without amendment, a privileged resolution (H. Res. 189) authorizing the printing as a document of a revised edition of House Document No. 151, Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "Digest of State Laws Affecting the Hard of Hearing and the Deaf," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a document a revised edition of House Document No. 151, Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "A Digest of State Laws Affecting the Hard of Hearing and the Deaf," compiled by the State Law Index Section of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, those interested in foreign commerce should read the article in today's issue of the Washington Post by Ernest K. Lindley. Some may be surprised that he should in that article damn with faint praise the reciprocal trade-agreements program, but if they will read the article with discriminating care, they will see that the real purpose is to implant the idea that in the post-war era it will be difficult, if not impossible, for private citizens in this country to trade with private citizens in foreign countries, and, therefore, our foreign trade

should be handled in the post-war era as it is now being handled, by the Board of Economic Warfare. All that the citizens of this country would have to pay for that method of handling foreign commerce would be to give up their liberty and our system of private enterprise.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Food Distribution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

CANDIDATES FOR PUBLIC OFFICE

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, an unfair blow was struck against the American soldier and sailor in uniform in a political ukase of the administration at Washington, prohibiting servicemen and women from being candidates for public office, except for reelection. The wounded, the maimed, or the disabled are thereby held to be ineligible for office even though the citizens of their city, county, or State, prefer otherwise. In a degree this order disfranchises American voters. Much is heard about our own concern over freedoms for the rest of the world, but, first, let us make sure that we do not take away rights of the American men and women who are fighting to save America.

This order as promulgated by the War Department prohibits a person on active duty with the armed forces from becoming a candidate, seeking office, or accepting office unless one held by him when he entered the active service.

Another section provides that a member of the military forces may be honorably discharged for the purposes of performing the duties of a public office.

This would in effect permit a person to be discharged should he be elected to an office he held prior to entering the service, but it would not authorize a discharge to seek office.

The order is ridiculous on the face of it. Has the time come in free America when men and women performing a patriotic duty to their country in time of national emergency are to be penalized for performing that duty? If this order will hold, then any man or woman of induction age selected by the electorate of any community in our country can be speedily put into the armed forces and by such induction declared to be ineligible to hold public office, unless that particular office was held by him prior to such entry. The vast majority of the men and women in the service today are not professional soldiers, but men and women imbued with only the thought of doing their duty to their country.

If the order is contrary to an individual's constitutional rights, which I say it is, it should be immediately rescinded as absolutely un-American. We are living in a free America, under a demo-

cratic form of Government. We are fighting for those things that we hold dear, to preserve our American form of life.

It is the inherent right of every American to seek public office if he so desires, and no order to the contrary should prevent him from so doing.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a gentlewoman of the Old South upon the subject of rationing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL STABILIZATION FUND

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, regarding Mr. Morgenthau's secret plan to establish an international stabilization fund: The people of this country must immediately be aroused to the crucial danger to our freedom and sovereignty that is involved in this clandestine movement.

Why all the secrecy?

Who wants to get control of our gold hoard?

Who are the real forces back of this sinister scheme?

Why did Mr. Morgenthau and the interests he represents, in setting up this plan, take the rest of the world into their confidence and fail to let our own people know anything about it?

I condemn this act as I consider it as being underhanded and wholly unfair to the American people.

I shall do all within my power to inform my people of the peril that is involved in this secret New Deal scheme.

KNOW-AS-YOU-GO TAXATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I favor a tax plan that will let the American people know-as-they-go. This House has so far rejected all plans for pay-as-you-go or pay-as-you-earn taxation. Precious months are slipping by, and we are not collecting taxes at the source nor are we providing a way for monthly payments. Much-needed revenue is being forever lost to the Treasury of the United States by the inaction of Congress.

What does the Government expect in the way of taxes from the 1943 income of our people and how can it be paid? The people have no way of knowing, yet half of the year will soon be gone. The least that this Congress can do is to let the taxpayers know what their current obligations are. Ten-twelfths of 1942 had gone by before the American taxpayer was advised of the 1942 rates.

If the taxpayer cannot get on a current basis so far as his payments are concerned, he should at least have current information as to what he must pay. If we cannot have pay-as-you-go, let us

at least have know-as-you-go. The Ways and Means Committee ought to either report out a bill or advise the country that they do not expect to offer any tax legislation for this year.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes after the completion of the legislative program and any other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article which appeared in the St. Joseph News-Press of St. Joseph, Mo., April 3, 1943, regarding the plight of the independent meat packers in my district because of the unfair and unjust rulings of the O. P. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

CANDIDATES FOR PUBLIC OFFICE

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, according to the news reports the War Department, a branch of the President's office, has made another move to further the fourth-term campaign by issuing an order which prevents a member of the armed services from seeking public office unless he held it before. This eliminates Gen. Douglas MacArthur for the present. It is a peculiar thing to do in war being fought allegedly to further the principles for which this one is being waged. With the selections thus narrowed down and our troops properly "educated" through censorship and the O. W. I. booklets promoting the personal prestige of the fourth-term candidate, the pattern takes on form.

Apparently the Postmaster General, who has just returned from a cross-country "inspection trip" at public expense has really had his ear to the ground and has given advice that it would be well for the administration not to enumerate its poultry before it incubates. The people are busy and preoccupied with winning the war, but do not miss the significance of politics as it is being played by some Washington leaders who should now be giving attention to public business rather than personal promotion.

Why was this order not issued before the congressional elections if it is necessary to win the war? Does the administration regret election of the gentleman from California, WILL ROGERS, Jr.? In fairness and out of respect for precedent the President should revoke the order.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an extract from the Washington Times-Herald of today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FISH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DAVID GINSBURG

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FREEDOM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I received a very interesting letter from a constituent of mine. I know this man. He is a man of poor circumstances. The letter so inspired me that I felt it would be well to call it to the attention of the House. It is an example and an inspiration.

The letter reads as follows:

SOUTH BOSTON, MASS., March 14, 1943.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: I have been notified by the War Department that my youngest son, Daniel F. Mahoney, has been killed in action in the south Pacific area, on December 17, 1942. It is needless to tell you how I feel, because I have two other sons in the service also.

Like every other father who worked hard to bring up his family, I had looked forward to the day when I hoped my boys would be a help to me. I had not figured on the advent of a Devil, who would murder and enslave the world. When the call came, I willingly offered my sons to preserve freedom. That I have lost one already, is sad, but we must go on to victory, and I assure you that behind our tears is a firm resolve to dig in all the harder, and when victory comes I will know that my boy did not die in vain. I will carry on regardless of cost.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES J. MAHONEY.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO TAX BILL

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on next Friday after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders, for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONSTITUTION DAY OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, May 3, 1943, immediately after reading the Journal on the disposition of all business on the Speaker's table, that I be permitted to address the House for 2 hours. May 3 is Constitution Day of our sister republic, Poland, and I desire this time to address the House with reference to the Polish Constitution Day, and I will yield such time as is requested by other Members to present their views on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL CADETS AT UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AND ADDITIONAL MIDSHIPMEN AT UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, on a recent occasion when Kenneth N. Walker, Jr., received from the hands of the President the Congressional Medal of Honor for his father, Brig. Gen. Kenneth N. Walker, United States Air Forces, who was last seen diving with a bomb load on the harbor of Rabaul, the President expressed the hope that he might be enabled to appoint Kenneth N. Walker, Jr., to the United States Military Academy. It occurred to me on the way back to the House of Representatives from that occasion that the sons of all of the men who receive the Congressional Medal of Honor, whether they be soldiers, sailors, or marines or officers in the Army or Navy, should be entitled to that opportunity.

I am therefore introducing a bill today, the title of which is "An act to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines who have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor."

The Congressional Medal of Honor may be awarded by the President in the name of the Congress to an officer, soldier, sailor, or marine, who shall "in action involving actual conflict with an enemy distinguish himself conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty"—July 9, 1918, chapter 143, Fortieth Statutes, page 870.

Thus far in this war 10 Congressional Medals of Honor have been awarded to Army men, 6 of whom are either missing in action or are known to have lost their lives. Since the beginning of World War

No. 1 approximately 110 Medals of Honor have been awarded Army men.

Navy men and marines numbering 36 have been awarded the Medal of Honor in this war and a total of 59 have received the award since the beginning of World War No. 1.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

USE OF FIBER CONTAINERS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, one sometimes wonders how much conservation departments and agencies of the Government practice in administering conservation orders affecting critical materials.

Not long ago a wholesale drug company in my district of Indiana was denied permission by the War Production Board to continue use of paper or fiber containers with waste metal friction top for packaging medicinal tablets. This company asked me, as their Congressman, to cooperate in filing an appeal. The matter was promptly taken up with the proper official of the War Production Board and the case reviewed.

Of course, the appeals board again denied the company use of that type of container and sent me a letter of explanation with an attached marked copy of the restriction order on which the decision was based. But did I receive the letter through the regular mail? No. It was delivered to my office by special messenger. And, fortunately for the messenger, he was not required to wear out his rationed shoes by walking the short distance from the War Production Board office to the House Office Building. He rode a motorcycle.

I wonder how much vital gasoline and rubber was used in sending, by special messenger, on the Government pay roll, a letter advising me that my constituent could not use his customary cardboard container because it had a cap that involved critical scrap metal.

The service was splendid, but hardly consistent with the times and practice.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address which I delivered last night on the subject What Follows This War?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] may be allowed to extend his own remarks in the

RECORD and include an editorial on certain expenses of the administration.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Washington Evening Star.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULLEN] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE COAST GUARD CUTTER "CAMPBELL"

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet tomorrow at 10:30 o'clock. It is hoped and expected that we shall have present Commander Hershfield of the Coast Guard cutter *Campbell*. If Members of the House desire to meet Commander Hershfield I extend the invitation to be present.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the Coast Guard cutter *Campbell* and to include therein the naval release with reference to the work of the cutter and other excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD my remarks on the Coast Guard in war and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LICK THE PLATTER CLEAN

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, due to the interest that has been shown from one end of the country to the other in my lick-the-platter-clean campaign, I want to report to you today that we received from the War Department a number of

posters, one of which I show you now, which they are in the process of distributing to all the Army camps, urging them to cooperate in my war on waste. Here also is a sticker which is being exhibited in a great many Washington restaurants.

Most of the restaurants in York, Pa., and many throughout the Twenty-second District of Pennsylvania have them on display. The saving of food is quite evident.

I am glad the Republican leadership of this House in its wisdom has organized a committee to study the food situation. Those in authority have long ago declared that "Food will win the war and write the peace." I was made very happy yesterday when I was told that I was going to be asked to appear before this committee. I shall be pleased to turn over to them such information as I have with such recommendations as I think are helpful along this line.

Nothing is so important today as to conserve our food and conserve it while we still have something to eat. It is much better to save food than to hunt it.

I am grateful for the cooperation I have received, and I am going to continue my war on waste until everyone has enough to eat for the duration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 45]

Anderson, Calif.	Gibson	Plumley
Arnold	Gordon	Randolph
Baldwin, Md.	Gorski	Richards
Baldwin, N. Y.	Guyer	Robison, Ky.
Barden	Harless, Ariz.	Rogers, Calif.
Bates, Ky.	Holmes, Mass.	Rowan
Bates, Mass.	Horan	Sabath
Bell	Howell	Sheppard
Bonner	Izac	Sikes
Boren	Johnson	Smith, Maine
Cannon, Fla.	J. Leroy	Smith, Va.
Clark	Kee	Snyder
Cox	Knutson	Starnes, Ala.
Culkin	LaFollette	Stevenson
Cullen	Lewis, Colo.	Thomason
Davis	McGranery	Treadway
Dawson	McKenzie	Wadsworth
Dingell	Maa	Weaver
Elliott	Magnuson	West
Ellison, Md.	Marrow	Winter
Fogarty	Mott	Wolverton, N. J.
Ford	Murdock	Woodrum, Va.
Furlong	Myers	
Gavagan	O'Toole	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 365 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. McCORMACK, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS]?

There was no objection.

ANSWERING AN UNJUST ATTACK

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will please state to the Chair his grounds.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday, April 2, in discussing a bill before the House, I was calling attention to the execution by the Soviet Government of two men, named Erlich and Alter. I was interrupted by the Member from New York [Mr. CELLER], and after I got an opportunity to make my speech, which, by the way, was after he had made his speech, he took his manuscript to his office, or at least got hold of it, amended it, and inserted in it some statements that were false, libelous, slanderous, and that he would not dare make on the floor of the House, and that no man would dare intimate in my presence outside of the House.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman give the Chair the language about which the gentleman complains?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to send his amended manuscript to the Speaker's desk and I am going to read it as I have it underlined in the RECORD so that the Chair may see that the statements of which I complain were inserted in the RECORD and were not spoken on the floor of the House.

You will note the first correction, Mr. Speaker, that in referring to me he uses this language:

He deliberately seeks to promote religious strife.

That is speaking about me.

He says further:

He glories in such strife. It tickles his vanity to create racial animosities.

Mr. Speaker, those statements were not spoken on the floor of the House, as the RECORD now before the Speaker will show. They were inserted by pen and ink later.

A moment later he uses this language with reference to me:

He singles me out in a way that shows his distorted point of view, his intolerance, his malice. When he adds a religious term to a Member he shows his contempt for the spirit and traditions of America. He brands himself as un-American.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that statement was not uttered on the floor. I could strike it from the RECORD, but I wanted to show to what depths these insertions go.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair believes that the language, not being spoken on the floor and no recourse being had at that time, is a reflection on the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the Chair recognizes the gentleman for 1 hour.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. No, not now; be seated.
Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield later?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. CELLER. Does the gentleman think when he characterized me as the Jewish gentleman from New York that that is fair and American?

Mr. RANKIN. No American Jew is ashamed of being called a Jew.

Mr. CELLER. Would the gentleman say "The Catholic gentleman from Massachusetts?"

Mr. RANKIN. If I did, he would think it was a compliment. If we were discussing an issue that involved a religious question, and the gentleman from Massachusetts should refer to me as the Methodist gentleman from Mississippi and I should refer to him as the Catholic gentleman from Massachusetts. Neither of us would be offended. Now, I decline to yield further.

There has been many a man expelled from this body for less than these insertions, reflecting on the character of fellow Members.

Then he goes on to say:

I am proud to be of the race of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Since when is it wrong or a crime to be born of the faith in which Jesus Christ and his Apostles were born? Can that be a crime? Is there anything reprehensible about it?

Mr. CELLER rose.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield.

Then he inserted these words:

The gentleman from Mississippi would have it so.

He did not say that on the floor.

Then he goes on further and says:

I am sure that if Moses himself would come into this Chamber he would meet the epithets—

Between the words "the" and "epithets" he inserted the word "contemptible," making it read:

I am sure that if Moses himself would come into this Chamber he would meet the contemptible epithets the gentleman directs toward me and my kind. Why?

He says:

My kind—

In the RECORD.

Then he says:

Why? Because Moses was of my faith.

Mr. Speaker, that is news to me.

Then a little later he inserted these words:

Even if Micah came into this Chamber the gentleman would cast at him mud and insults, only because he was a Jew.

Mr. CELLER. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield now; and I am not going to be disturbed.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the words indicated by the gentleman were spoken in the House. Can the gentleman still have the right to rise to a question of personal privilege?

The SPEAKER. The Speaker has already recognized the gentleman from Mississippi and has said that the gentleman has stated a question of personal privilege. The gentleman from Mississippi certainly may read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; and the part that I am referring to was inserted later in pen and ink, and it is before the Speaker now.

Then he goes on and inserts a paragraph, a whole paragraph, that was not spoken on the floor in which he said:

The pending bill seeks to meet the activities of these spies, seeks to anticipate, contrary to the short-sightedness of the gentleman from Mississippi, and prevent the carrying out of the nefarious designs of these Nazi and Axis conspirators.

I do not object to any man calling me "short-sighted." I know I have limitations, and I have no objection to that characterization, because it is within the rules. But I am just reading and getting down to the real thing.

Then he goes on and speaks of the T. V. A. dam being blown up, and so forth, and down at the bottom he says:

Until the information was sent forth with resulting sinking—

And so forth. Then at the last he adds these words:

As to his base remarks—

Now, I was discussing the execution of a couple of Communist traitor Jews in Russia. I was not coupling the gentleman from New York with them. I will come to that question in a minute. He inserted these words that were not spoken on the floor.

As to his base remarks the gentleman from Mississippi only bespatters himself. His cruel and menacing observations are all the more tragic in the light of what is happening to Jews in Axis-controlled countries, where they are being daily massacred, murdered, decimated, exterminated by starvation, lethal gases, suffocation, high-voltage electrocutions, and machine guns by the tens of thousands. Two million have already perished, 4,000,000 more await death or a slavery worse than death.

Nobody has condoned that mistreatment. My people are paying now, and have been for years, to try to relieve the suffering of Jews and Gentiles in the Axis countries, including the suffering Negroes in Ethiopia, as well as the people of China.

Then he inserted these words:

Never have I heard a word of pity or lament or protest from the gentleman from Mississippi. It is not in him to do so.

I wonder if the disabled veterans of this country would agree with that remark.

As to his derelictions—

That is, mine—

I repeat the words out of St. Luke—

Mr. Speaker, he is about the last man in this House who ought to call in St. Luke. He quotes St. Luke as follows:

Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.

Those were the words of the suffering Saviour, who had been persecuted by the fifth columnists of that day. He was not speaking of my kind, because the people I sprang from were not responsible for that horrible crucifixion.

Then he inserted this statement:

And I also remind the gentleman: "The Jew has stood at the graveside of all his persecutors" and tormentors and baiters.

Mr. Speaker, let us see what brought on this controversy. The reason I did not ask the House to strike these remarks from the RECORD is that I am tired of seeing patriotic Americans besmeared and beslimed and accused of being unpatriotic when they are doing everything they can to win this war and when their sons are dying on every battlefield in the world.

I showed the other day that there were a couple of men executed in Russia. I did not use my own words. I took PM, the prayer book of the highbrowed Communists in this country. Here is what PM says. These are the headlines:

Poles score Soviet charge. They insist executed Jews did not try to make peace.

Then it goes on to attack the Russian Government for executing these two Jews, Erlich and Alter.

Then I turned to The Ghetto, a publication that has been coming to the Members' desks attacking Members of Congress and attacking patriotic Americans who are doing their duty. I am going to read again what that publication said:

On Thursday, February 25, 1943, the American representation of the General Jewish Workers' Union of Poland received a telephone call from William Green concerning a letter which he had received from Maxim Litvinov, Soviet Ambassador in the United States, informing him about the execution of the two prominent anti-Fascists and Socialists, Henryk Erlich and Victor Alter. A similar letter was received by Philip Murray and Wendell Willkie. We are now publishing the letter for the first time.

I am going to read the letter again:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 23, 1943.

DEAR SIR: I am informed by Mr. Molotov, People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs, of the receipt of him of a telegram signed by you concerning two Soviet citizens, Alter and Erlich. I am instructed by Mr. Molotov to inform you of the following facts:

For active subversive work against the Soviet Union and assistance to Polish intelligence organs in armed activities, Erlich and Alter were sentenced to capital punishment in August 1941.

At the request of the Polish Government, Erlich and Alter were released in September 1941.

However, after they were set free at the time of the most desperate battles of the Soviet troops against the advancing Hitler army, they resumed their hostile activities including appeals to the Soviet troops to stop bloodshed and immediately to conclude peace with Germany. For this they were rearrested and, on December 1942, sentenced once more to capital punishment by the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court.

This sentence has been carried out in regard to both of them.

Yours sincerely,

AMBASSADOR MAXIM LITVINOV.

Mr. Speaker, that was what I was bringing out the other day, when those attacks were being made, not on the floor of the House, but in the cloakroom. Let me clear up one thing now once and for all. A year or two ago I made a short statement in which I happened to use the expression "Our Jewish brethren." One gentleman attempted to reply to me. He evidently did not understand what I said. He later had a heart attack and died, and I saw some men walk down in this well and perpetrate the most ghoulis performance I have ever witnessed in my life, and actually, throughout the country, they tried to accuse me of killing that man, with whom I was on the most friendly terms. I had no more to do with his death than one of you did.

Then the other day, when I was trying to prevent what I feared was a dangerous precedent in this House, and when I was bringing out the fact that these Trotsky Communists had been trying to overthrow the Stalin regime right in the middle of this war, when the Russian Army was fighting on the northern front to keep that vast horde of German soldiers off the American and English Armies, when I was bringing those facts out, these attacks occurred.

Let me say this here and now: I have never at any time attacked an American Jew. I have known them all my life. The old line American Jews are just as patriotic as you or I. Many of them are worried to death about this communistic group in this country, and all over the world, that is stirring up this trouble for them. I have not called attention to the fact that they have crowded into the Government departments. We have all remained silent because we did not wish to stir up trouble for these people. One leading Member of the House said the other day that there were 39 times as many Jews on the Government pay roll as they are numerically entitled to. I am the chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and I am receiving protests all the time that 60 percent of the doctors sent into the hospitals come from them; but I have refrained from mentioning the question here on the floor, even in the face of the slime that was smeared throughout the country 2 years ago.

But when a man continues to sit like a drunken man on a keg of powder striking matches with both hands, then it is time for somebody to answer, and especially when one goes to this depth, to attack a fellow Member, and make such charges as have been made against me here, charges that every man on this floor knows to be untrue.

They were getting ready for a big mass meeting in New York in protest against the execution of these men, Erlich and Alter. How do you think that would sound to your boy in north Africa or in Guadalcanal? There is a picture here of the celebration of the meeting in protest against the execution of these men. Now, you may not like Stalin, you may not like Russia, but Russia is in this war with us, whether you like it or not, and

the Russian Army is giving a wonderful account of itself, and anything that is done here to disturb the Russian Army or the Russian regime or stir up rebellion in Russia could be fatal to the cause of the Allies, and cost the lives of untold thousands and tens of thousands of patriotic Americans. These Communists are what I am complaining of and not the patriotic American Jews. I am complaining of these Communists who are stirring up race trouble all over this country. They have gone among the Negroes and are stirring up trouble for the white people of the South, and here in the District of Columbia, as we have never had it stirred since the darkest days of reconstruction. What is that for? Is that to aid the cause of the Allies? There are no more patriotic people under the shining sun than the people of the Southern States. When your forebears and mine were locked in deadly conflict in the War Between the States, those old men will tell you that no soldiers on earth ever gave a better account of themselves than did the Confederate soldiers. So we, the sons of Confederate and Federal soldiers, are fighting to maintain our civilization, to maintain our way of life, and to save our institutions; and yet we have these communistic elements in this country going around trying to stir up trouble. Listen to this PM. After one of its tirades it says, speaking of the execution of Erlich and Alter:

It is bound to haunt American-Soviet relations for a long time to come.

Haunt those relations with whom? Not with the patriotic Americans who glory in the victories of the Russian Army.

I hope if anybody else goes over there, Jew or gentile, and attempts to stir up a revolution, that Stalin does them the same way.

I was calling attention in that debate to that indictment which you will find in the Record of March 29. It goes on to smear people all over the United States. I submit it includes such organizations as the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Legion, and many other patriotic organizations.

I am not a member of the America First Committee. I never was; I never attended one of their meetings. I noticed the picture of a familiar face over in the southwest Pacific. I remember they attacked him 2 years ago because they said he was a member of the America First Committee which was disbanded as soon as we entered the war. He may have been, but God bless your soul, when I saw that bandaged form, a man who had gone through the hell of war, I recognized my old friend, one of the great patriots of America, Hanford McNider, of Iowa.

You should get this indictment and read it. I am for prosecuting all criminals, but I am not for smearing patriotic Americans. I am opposed to anyone abusing the Dies committee.

If you do not know it, you can find out that the American people are 95 percent behind the Dies committee. When this

conflict is over, if we save our form of government, our institutions, and our way of life, the American people will build a monument to the Dies committee for the patriotic services it has rendered in trying to expose German, Japanese, Italian, Communist, and every other subversive fifth-columnist element in the United States.

Now they are trying to use the Negro as a smokescreen. Of all people on earth. They are trying to shove them into every place here for that purpose. You remember that Mr. Kopplemann had a bill here to make it a penalty not to take them into all the dining rooms, all the hotels, picture shows, and restaurants. The decent Negroes do not want that. I know more about the Negro than any of these flannel-mouth agitators who are running around trying to mislead you about his welfare. I grew up among them. It is no disgrace for him to be called a Negro. If I were a Negro I would want to be as black as the ace of spades. I would not want anybody to think I was anything but a real Negro, and if this gang would let me alone I would have the best time on earth.

I am going to read you this word, if I may, and I want you to listen to this. A great American once said—

I am bringing this to your attention. You cannot destroy the white man's civilization in this country. You cannot destroy the white people of the Southern States. You can sign all these crazy petitions you want to. They will rise up to haunt you in the years to come.

A great American said, in a great debate in this country:

I will say that I am not and never have been in favor of bringing about in any way the social equality of the white and black races.

He said:

I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two living on terms of social equality.

Do you know who said that? One of the greatest of all Americans—Abraham Lincoln. He said that in his debate with Stephen A. Douglas.

Now, we have a condition to deal with in the South. I am not worried about these attacks on me. I am able to take care of myself on the floor of this House. I know how to debate within the rules. I know how to respect the feelings and the rights of others. We have a condition down in the Southern States—and we have a condition here in Washington—that these Communists are making worse.

They are likely to bring on a race riot here any time. These Communists who go out here and eat and drink and dance with these Negroes are not only disgracing themselves, but the Negroes have contempt for them. They are bringing trouble to their own people and stirring up trouble for the white gentiles, as well as for the Negroes in the District of Columbia.

I have a letter in my pocket from two white girls, from my own State, who had to resign and go home because they said

they were forced to use the same wash room and the same toilet with a bunch of Negroes, a large proportion of whom the Health Department says are infected with venereal diseases.

There are only four solutions of the Negro question. One of them is extermination. No man would think of that. Another one is deportation, which is impossible, especially at this time. Another one would be amalgamation, which would destroy the white man's civilization, and the Negro's too. You go to those countries that have amalgamated with them and you will see that they have gone down.

The last method is segregation. The only possible hope to get along with them, and for the Negro to enjoy those blessings to which he is entitled, is to keep them segregated. They will have a better time and you will, too. It has been said that we mistreat them at home. That is all false; the Negro has a better time where I live than he does in Washington, because he behaves himself and gets protection. We see that he is not disturbed. If we were to catch a bunch of these flannel-mouthed agitators dancing with a bunch of Negroes in Tupelo, the Negroes would get a little lecture, but what would happen to the other crowd would be something to write home about. The Negroes at home can go out and shoot craps among themselves and you can hardly get a justice of the peace to fine them for it, but you let us catch a white man out there robbing them in a crap game and he gets all the law will allow and then we add a little for good measure.

They live in peace down there. They are living in harmony, and yet these communistic agitators are doing everything they can to stir up this trouble for them and for us.

Now, I do not want to take up your time. My people came here 300 years ago to get away from persecutions in the Old World. My ancestors went through the Revolutionary War. One of my great great uncles, as I said before, who once served in this House, followed Andrew Jackson in the War of 1812 and gave his life at the Alamo in order that Texas might be free. The only uncle I had of military age in the Civil War died at the Second Battle of Bull Run. Throughout the World War, and today in this war, my own people are on every front in the world, fighting for what? To preserve this Republic, to preserve our form of government and our way of life, and no scavenger is going to get up on this floor and smear me or any other patriotic Americans from now on if I can help it.

We are in a great war. We are not only in a war abroad, but we are in a war at home; we are in a war to keep subversive elements from undermining and destroying our form of government and our way of life. Let every American assert himself. As I said, I could have struck this material from the RECORD, but I wanted to show you the kind of stuff that has been used to smear me here and over the country.

I am convinced that if we lose this war we lose our form of government, our lib-

erties, and our way of life. This intimation that men who are supporting the Dies committee are sympathetic with Hitler is the most contemptible slander I have ever heard. No; whether they be Jew or gentile, those men who are really fighting America's battles have my admiration. You know I did not want this war. God knows I knelt and prayed; I almost did so in this well and at the White House to plead that something might be done which I thought would avert this catastrophe before it ever broke out in Europe, because I thought I could see ahead crepe on the doorknobs of almost every home in Europe and America.

I could see the mothers, broken-hearted as they turned their faces to the chairs made vacant by the old fireside to weep the tears of broken hearts for those sons they are sending forth to fight to preserve this Republic. I could see the fathers, bowed as it were "by the weight of centuries, the emptiness of the ages in their faces, and on their backs the burdens of the world," bowed down in grief for those sons that your communities and mine are sending to this war. I had no respect for Hitler; I had none for Mussolini; but I was in hopes that something might be done to avert this calamity. When, however, my country became involved, and long before Pearl Harbor, I was for adequate preparedness. I was one of the advocates of Billy Mitchell here when Billy Mitchell was on trial. Had enough men backed us up at that time we would have had an adequate air force and there would have been no Pearl Harbor disaster.

We are in this war to win, we are going to bend every effort to that end; but I want to tell you now the American people are not going to stand for certain subversive elements stirring up trouble in this country.

God grant that throughout the ages yet to come, no hostile power may ever set foot upon American soil. God grant that those principles laid down by Jefferson and Washington, and sustained by all our great statesmen down to the present time, may be preserved. May we, the recipients of American liberty, that proud heritage of patriotism, conceived in the minds of the greatest statesmen the world has ever produced, guarded, and protected by the undying loyalty of a noble ancestry, may we forever preserve and defend that liberty in our time and transmit it unimpaired to our posterity that this great Republic may go down to the future with strength in her loins, hope in her soul, and the Miriam song of triumph on her lips.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman in his remarks of April 2, Friday last, put into the RECORD statements which he did not make on the floor of the House. He said among other things:

I want to say in reply to the gentleman from New York that he has been attacking the white people of the South ever since he has been in Congress. He is doing the Jews of this country immeasurable harm.

I believe it is a reflection upon my integrity when he states that I am doing the people of my faith immeasurable harm, and I should like to spend a few moments with reference to countering that charge.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman send that RECORD up to the chair? Does the gentleman from New York have the transcript and know that that was inserted?

Mr. CELLER. I have not the transcript with me, but I remember what was stated by the gentleman and it is not reflected accurately in the RECORD.

Furthermore, the gentleman made the statement that I was the Jewish gentleman from New York; and on that score I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wants to see the original transcript of the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. CELLER. I can read more; there is more in that RECORD, Mr. Speaker, which was not uttered on the floor of the House. I shall be very brief, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not going to rule on this question without seeing the original transcript and it is not here. If there is no objection, the gentleman may proceed for 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I believe it violates unduly the esprit de corps that should exist in this House; it violates the decorum that should animate all Members thereof, to address anyone as "the Jewish Congressman from New York" as did the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] last Friday. If that were to go unabated and were to continue we would then have ourselves in this very anomalous and highly dangerous position where a Member would address another Member as "the Catholic gentleman from Massachusetts," as "the Protestant gentleman from Mississippi," as "the Czechoslovakian Member from Wisconsin," or "the Polish Member from Michigan," or as "the Mormon gentleman from Utah." That would violate beyond peradventure of doubt the spirit and traditions of the deliberations of this House. It would be violative of the very spirit of our Constitution.

Upon reflection, I am sure the gentleman from Mississippi regrets making the statement of characterization of me as "the Jewish gentleman from New York." I am sure that the man he praised the other day, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, Judah P. Benjamin, of Civil War fame, would not have risen in the other Chamber and addressed the other distinguished Senator from Mississippi, Jefferson Davis, as "the Protestant Senator from Mississippi." Nor would Senator Davis have addressed the gentleman from Louisiana as "the Jewish Senator from Louisiana." Judah P. Benjamin held three Cabinet offices in the Confederacy and we are all proud of him. He was a Jew.

Danger, great danger, lurks in these characterizations and I do hope that the gentleman from Mississippi in the future will not use that type of address to any Member of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, if the gentleman does not want to be called the Jewish gentleman, I have no objection to never calling him that again, but I want to say one thing: Judah P. Benjamin never would have stuck that stuff in the Record that was put in there on the 2d.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman for that statement and I hope he will abide by that good intention.

Mr. RANKIN. And I want to say this to the gentleman from New York: I am not withdrawing what I said about the gentleman from New York trying to stir up this fight against the South on these various bills that have been before the House.

Mr. CELLER. And I am not withdrawing the statements I may have made with reference to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. You will not get outside of this House and make those statements, and if you make them against any other Member here you will probably be expelled.

The SPEAKER. Now, the gentleman from Mississippi must be careful.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Mississippi ought to be careful in more respects than one in that regard.

I have a perfect right to quote from the teachings of St. Luke. I firmly believe in many of the glorious observations made by the Apostles. There is much of glowing mercy and charity and forgiveness in the words of St. Luke and the Apostles and I glory in the fact that my memory permits me on the floor of the House to quote their ennobling phrases, their inspiring phrases.

The gentleman from Mississippi with one breath seeks to praise the race from whence I sprang and in another breath seeks in his subtle way to stir up animosity. I hope he will not do that again. I hope that better judgment will reside within him. But he has in the past handed the Members of my race and you gentlemen of the House a stick of dynamite in a silk glove. I do indeed hope that he will not repeat those characterizations of my people.

There have been goodly numbers of my people in all the wars of the United States. I shall not enumerate them. You know them all. I could read to you of the many war decorations received by the members of the race of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as I did the other day. I shall not repeat those names. It is unnecessary.

I shall end this brief statement with what Washington said when he was visiting the Portuguese synagogue in Newport and was welcomed by its congregation in a pathetic letter of welcome. His reply is memorable and it is well oft-times to repeat:

The citizens of the United States of America have the right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike, liberty of con-

science and immunities of citizenship. Happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live—

And so forth; and he wound up as follows:

May the children of the stock of Abraham who dwell in this land continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other inhabitants, while everyone shall sit in safety under his own vine and fig tree, and there shall be none to make him afraid.

If we continue to stir up religious animosities and racial difficulties, I fear that we cannot follow the admonitions of the glorious Washington.

I fear that we cannot sit in safety under our own vine and fig tree, for there will be those to make us afraid. I earnestly ask the gentleman from Mississippi in the future by his remarks and by his observations not to make us afraid.

Finally, in the revision of my remarks, it is well to quote from Peter, chapter 5, verse 5:

Yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility; for God resisteth the proud and giveth grace to the humble.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1944

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2397, with Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries: For Secretary of State; Under Secretary of State, \$10,000; Counselor, \$10,000; and other personal services in the District of Columbia, including not to exceed \$6,500 for employees engaged on piece-work at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of State; \$5,693,000, of which \$40,000 is hereby made available, without regard to civil-service and classification laws, for salaries of members and other employees of the Visa Board of Appeals and salaries may be paid to the members of such Board at a rate not exceeding \$10,000 per annum each.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on February 9 the House passed the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill. The Members will recall the sound and the fury of that debate when an amendment was offered to strike the names of 36 people from the public pay roll for reasons of subversive activity. Mark you well the date. It was the 9th day of February, according to the calendar, that that bill was enacted and passed by the House.

There was considerable storm and considerable controversy. As a result, a

separate subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations was created for the purpose of taking testimony and of according fair hearing to those who had been so charged. Since the 9th of February there have been six or seven appropriation bills enacted by this House; the independent offices bill, the first deficiency bill, the additional Navy bill, the civil functions bill, and now the State, Justice, and Commerce bill, to be followed by the legislative bill. The House has shown admirable restraint and patience in letting this matter reside in that committee for a determination. But 60 days have elapsed.

I am wondering what this subcommittee has been doing. Frankly, it will be 60 days this week since that subcommittee has been created. Other appropriation bills will be submitted and they will include the names of some people on whom there has been a report by investigators of our own committee and whose names I propose to bring into this well unless some action is taken reasonably soon. I should like to hear from some of the members of this special subcommittee. I understand that only a single witness has thus far been brought before the committee.

I recognize, of course, that time is necessary for organization. I recognize that some procedural set-up must be developed. I recognize that a counsel has to be employed. But I submit on the other hand that assurance was given us by the chairman of the full committee that no time would be lost, and that we would not be foreclosed from an opportunity to deal with this thing on other appropriation bills in case that committee failed to report. So when we are ready to bring in the Agricultural appropriation bill sometime next week, I propose to exercise my rights and prerogatives, which I heretofore exercised when I had David Lasser stricken from the roll—and the Senate confirmed that action and the President signed the bill, and I propose to follow the same course unless there is some evidence and some indication of affirmative, positive, and speedy action on the part of the subcommittee that was created for this distinct purpose.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. May I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that this House was led astray? We were definitely assured by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that these charges would be investigated immediately, and that is 60 days ago.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not know particularly whether we were led astray, but I do know that we did have definite assurance that we would have action, and early action, and there has been no such action. This week will mark the sixtieth day since the House was in a mood to deal with the matter in connection with the Treasury-Post Office bill.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. May I say to the gentleman that the committee was in session this morning from 10 o'clock until 12 and will go into session again at 2 o'clock this afternoon and stay in session most of the afternoon. All I should like to know is, What more would the gentleman require of us?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There has been no preliminary report—there has been no intimation whatever of action. Notwithstanding that fact, appropriation bills where the names of alleged subversive people are carried on the rolls are moving across the floor of this House week after week. So I believe that at least this House is entitled to some kind of information as to what the subcommittee has been doing.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I am not trying to quarrel with the gentleman. I think he is trying to be fair in this matter. But I believe it is also important to point out that you cannot give a preliminary report as to whether a man is a fit or unfit person to stay on the pay roll.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, may I remind the Committee that we have been delayed now with this bill and that this is the third day we have had it on the floor. We are going to try to proceed in order. I am not going to object to this request, but we certainly must speed up the consideration of this bill today.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, the chairman says this is the third day we have had this bill under consideration, but many of us have not yet had a chance to speak. How much time are we going to have? Are we going to get the usual 5 minutes or not?

Mr. RABAUT. We are here until 20 minutes past 6 last night.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I was here until 7.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will withdraw the request and remain within the rule, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RABAUT. No; I am willing to let the gentleman have that additional time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Other Members can take the time and belabor this particular issue that has been raised because it is a matter of vital interest and many Members have made repeated inquiry concerning the action of the special subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws his request.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I am a Member of the Committee on Appropriations. I do not know whether that counts or not.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be recognized as a member of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair first recognized the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and then, on looking further, he saw the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] on his feet. The gentleman from Wisconsin first got the eye of the Chair and asked for recognition. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RABAUT. Does the Chair mean that the chairman of the subcommittee is not to be recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair first recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, two Members, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], a member of the minority of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], of the majority, are both members of the subcommittee. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] happens to be the chairman of the particular committee that was appointed, concerning which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] spoke a few moments ago. He is also the ranking member of the committee that has the bill before the House today.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, is this parliamentary inquiry going to take up all of my time?

Mr. RABAUT. I shall ask that the gentleman have additional time.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands it, a member of the Committee on Appropriations has the same right as those who are members of that committee who happen to be members of a subcommittee. That is the parliamentary procedure, as the Chair understands it. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Wisconsin. Had he not done so, he certainly would have recognized the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin be started here at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, apparently we are getting down to some pretty fine points here in the matter of obtaining recognition, and apparently physical size counts, because I am somewhat larger than the others, and will be seen first. I rise in view of the fact that I happen to be a member of this subcommittee that has been the subject of some inquiry by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and I thought perhaps the House might be interested in knowing just a few of the things which have been inquired about. I would be very glad to defer to the distinguished chairman of the committee if I thought he was interested in making a statement, but perhaps I can mollify the apprehensions of the gentleman from Illinois with reference to the work of this subcommittee. I have been just as apprehensive as anybody else about

this subcommittee. I have been available every day since the subcommittee was created, to go to work. But this job is not just as simple and just as easy as it may seem. I recall when the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations came onto the floor of the House he said we were going to have this subcommittee appointed, and it would go to work and start reporting the next day. Apparently the members thought that is what the procedure would be. As a matter of fact the committee had to get organized, and the purpose of organizing this committee was to afford opportunity for those people who are subject to charges, to have an opportunity to know what the charges are and to be given an opportunity to come before the committee. It would be sensible, would it not, to suggest that they would require that the charges be preferred, and that the men against whom the charges are to be preferred, be advised of what the charges are. The fact of the matter is that we endeavored to secure an attorney, and went at it promptly, as the members of the committee know, and we have had just one terrific time to get any attorney to act as a counsel for this committee. We have one now. The committee is at work. We have had a great deal of difficulty getting the charges presented to the committee. All of the charges against all of these people are not before the committee yet. It has taken the Dies committee a tremendous amount of work in order to assemble this information and submit it in proper form to our committee, and the distinguished chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], is present, and he will agree with what I am saying. They have not been able to get together the mass of information they have to see, so that the proper exhibits are photostated and submitted in proper form to our committee to give consideration to.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. I wish my colleague on this subcommittee would also point out to the House that there are 38 or 39 Government employees that we are investigating. I wish he would also point out to the House that in every case there is a mass of testimony at least 3 feet high. We first have to look over the Dies committee testimony, and then the findings of the Department of Justice, and then the interdepartmental committee, and then the Civil Service Committee. There are four of them, and there are thousands and thousands of pages, and if anyone would like to have my job on that committee I wish he would take it and do it this afternoon, and they may have the opportunity of doing it very shortly.

Mr. KEEFE. And I will tender the same suggestion myself, that I would be happy to be relieved of that responsibility.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How could anybody get on that particular committee who is not a member of the Committee on Appropriations? That is fine for these two gentlemen to offer to resign, but how can anybody get on the committee?

Mr. KEEFE. The members of this House know that so far as I am concerned I have been more active trying to get at this thing, and get this job done, but if you think it is any little peanut job you have another guess coming. We have been now engaged for 3 or 4 days—4 day—with one witness, and we are going on again at 2 o'clock this afternoon, and if the witness has his way we will be there for 4 weeks to listen to the story that he wants to tell. This committee is trying to be fair, and so far as I am concerned we are going to get the facts, and the facts are going to be presented to this House. As far as I am concerned, the chips are going to fall where they will. That is all there is to it. You have to be patient and give us a chance to bring the truth and the facts to this House. You will get them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I think my distinguished friend and colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has made a correct statement with reference to the committee which was appointed to investigate the several charges made against various employees of this Government under a recent resolution.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin has well said, this was a great deal larger job than any of us thought we had to undertake. I can say, and can say candidly and say truthfully, that we have endeavored as diligently as possible to organize our committee and to make these investigations. It might be interesting to say to you gentlemen that each member of this committee has had an opportunity to go back to his district and endeavor to get someone from his district or from his State to appear as attorney for this committee. It seemed to be impossible for us to secure a proper man, the kind of man that we wanted, here in Washington. The House can hardly realize that we have not only the duty of looking into the charges made by the Dies committee, but we are charged with the duty of taking five different investigations and going through them and examining the charges made against these Government employees charged with subversive activities, and then to invite the accused to appear before us if he wishes, in order that we may say to them, "Here is what you are alleged to have said. Here is what you are alleged to have done. What do you say as to your activities with this organization or this group of people?"

We have succeeded in getting an attorney. We have an attorney who, because of his knowledge of the law, his diligence, and his great character, will make a correct and judicious study of all of these charges and be able to bring them to the committee and tell us, "Here is what the evidence discloses in respect

to this gentleman and in respect to the charges made against him."

There are 5 different batches of evidence—voluminous evidence—that have been taken against every one of these men charged with subversive activities. We are compelled, under this order and under this resolution not only to examine just what the Dies committee said about these employees or found out about them but we are charged with the duty of taking the records of the investigations made by the departments themselves with respect to these employees, and by the interdepartmental committee and the investigation made by the F. B. I. of these employees accused of subversive activities and by the Civil Service Commission. You can see what a job we have. Every man on this committee has been diligent and has been endeavoring to get it under way as quickly as possible. Although we have been asking for the last 6 weeks to get the full evidence upon which we could make inquiry and present it to the charged party, we have only been able to get the full evidence on 3 of the 38 men who are charged in this resolution.

Mr. DIES. I think the gentleman is mistaken on that.

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DIES. You have evidence on 10.

Mr. KERR. From the Dies committee.

Mr. DIES. From the Dies committee.

Mr. KERR. I think the gentleman is probably correct as to parts of the Dies committee evidence, but, as a matter of fact, I do not think there has been but three or not over four cases of the full charges and complete evidence made against these men furnished our committee to date. On April 1 we had only one case from the Dies committee which was full and complete and included recent testimony before the Dies committee. The accused in this one was heard before us the next day.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. POWERS. May I suggest to my distinguished chairman "yes" on the first 10 cases we have the evidence from the Dies committee.

Mr. KERR. That is true.

Mr. POWERS. But the House must realize that we do not have all the evidence on those entire 10 cases. We have the evidence on 3, because the Dies committee evidence is only 1 portion of the evidence. Again let me state that all the interdepartmental evidence is needed; we need the F. B. I. evidence and we need the civil service evidence, and you have to get all those things and correlate them. It has been an impossibility to get 10 complete. If we take as long with every other witness as we have taken with this witness we will be at it for a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is necessary at this point in the Record to develop the chronological history of what the Congress has been trying to do with

reference to getting subversive people off the pay roll.

First, we establish the Dies committee, which has had the support of 95 percent of the people of the United States. Then it was claimed by the executive department that the Dies committee reports are based upon opinion. In order to double check these charges that the Dies committee made, I was the author of a resolution that was passed and made a part of the 1942 fiscal-year supply bill, which allocated \$100,000 of the F. B. I. funds to investigate the employees on the Federal pay roll or the organizations whom the Dies committee said were subversive. I contemplated at that time that the F. B. I., as it completed its investigation, would report to the Congress on each employee. The positive mandate of the amendment required a report immediately to Congress. The argument on behalf of the amendment was to get factual information that the F. B. I. had uncovered on each subversive Federal employee or organization.

After about 9 months of the fiscal year had elapsed I had some correspondence and conversation with the Attorney General's office, and asked them to give Congress this factual information. Sixteen months ago, just before we reported out the first appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1943, I tried to get this factual information for our supply bills that we considered last year. We did not get it. The Attorney General and his subordinates said they were not ready to report yet. Finally I talked with the Attorney General at the hearings in February of last year. He did not pose any objection to giving Congress this information. He said the investigation was taking a lot of time and that there was some question when to report. I kept urging an immediate report. Then after the fiscal year ended we got one report from the Attorney General's office.

Mr. KERR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I would like to proceed for just a minute and then I will yield.

Not until the end of the fiscal year did we get any kind of a report from the Attorney General. When that report came to Congress it did not contain the textual information on anybody that the F. B. I. had investigated. The Congress does not know and did not know then from reports submitted to it what individuals should be fired for subversive activities, because the textual facts reported by the F. B. I. stayed in the Attorney General's possession.

We then got a second report later on, the first of this calendar year. Congress still did not get the textual, factual information so that we could weed A, B, and C from the Federal pay roll. I insisted in the hearings this year that the Attorney General's office had not complied with the intent and purpose of Congress when it passed this amendment. In last year's supply bill—the one for this present fiscal year—another amendment was included earmarking \$200,000 of F. B. I. funds to get this factual information. In that amendment I provided that the F. B. I. should report the findings forthwith to Con-

gress. I asked Mr. J. Edgar Hoover this year why we had not gotten the factual information on the individual cases. He testified, as appears on pages 242 and 243 of the hearings, that he was requested and directed by the Attorney General not to give the factual information to Congress but to give it to the boss, the Attorney General.

If the interdepartmental committee of the executive branch of the Government is holding up the information for this special committee of the Appropriations Committee to investigate these charges, I say that they were an illegal committee in the first place, in my estimation.

The time has come when we cannot be held up any further by the Attorney General's delay. The delay is not Mr. Hoover's fault, because he is willing to comply.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, our committee has submitted to the special committee headed by the gentleman from North Carolina the evidence which we had in our files in 10 cases. We also subpoenaed and heard these 10 witnesses.

I believe a great deal of the trouble arises from a lack of understanding of what the policy of the Congress should be. In almost every case these Government employees have admitted most of the charges that I made on the floor of this House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield briefly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The statement was made that they had not been able to find any charges yet. Will the gentleman tell us something about that?

Mr. DIES. I do not think the gentleman meant that; what the gentleman meant, and what I am sure he will agree to, was that on this subject that has taken our committee nearly 5 years to understand, he and the other members of the subcommittee are experiencing the same difficulty we experienced for a long time after we began this work.

The point I want to make is this and I want our distinguished colleague from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] to listen to these observations: I think there will be no contest about the fact that these charges are substantially correct. I think that in the great majority of the cases these Government employees will agree, as they have agreed before our committee in the past 10 days, that they were associated and affiliated with these various organizations or that they were the authors of various books, pamphlets, and speeches expressing certain sentiments which I have heretofore read to the House and which in my opinion clearly show that at least at one time they were not in favor of our form of government. In no case has the author publicly repudiated his views as previously expressed.

We are not trying these people for crimes, we are not seeking to impose any penalty; it is just a question in my mind

like this: Here is a man who not once but we will say upon a number of occasions has openly associated and affiliated with an organization which our committee unanimously found to be subversive. And in passing let me say we have three Republicans and four Democrats upon our committee, and everyone knows we have had some outstanding progressives on our committee such as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] and the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIES]; and all of our reports with the possible exception of one were unanimous findings of the committee. But you have more evidence than that. The Department of Justice was unwilling to accept our findings so they established their own interdepartmental committee, and this committee pursued its own independent inquiry into what organizations were subversive and they reached certain conclusions that were stronger than our findings. So you have our committee's findings, you have the Department of Justice findings, and you have the fact that certain Government employees were affiliated with organizations that are subversive. It seems to me that if you would require any committee to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a man is subversive or even to prove that he is a Communist that you could never accomplish anything, because manifestly the members of the Communist Party are secret members. Neither the F. B. I., nor our committee, nor any other agency has ever been successful in securing the membership list of the Communist Party. All members of the Communist Party are instructed to perjure themselves. They do not hesitate under oath to deny their affiliation with the Communist Party, although we have conclusive proof that there are approximately 165,000 dues-paying members. So it would seem to me that in dealing with merely the question of whether or not these people shall hold appointive jobs that we in the Congress should establish a policy that when any Government employee knowingly or carelessly affiliates or associates with a subversive organization that he should not be given employment in our Government. Let me show you how simple this is in the case of Nazi organizations. Our committee, of course, has exposed a number of Nazi organizations in this country. Suppose these 38 Government employees had been officers and members of the German-American Bund.

How long do you think it would take to strike them from the pay roll of this Government? Yet the Communist Party by the findings of our committee and by the findings of the Attorney General is just as revolutionary, just as disloyal and unpatriotic as the German-American Bund.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I made an ob-

jection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIES. I may say that the House really wants to have this explanation.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to know whether the gentleman is going to apply the rule that he announced awhile ago or whether he is going to let this out-of-order debate continue?

Mr. RABAUT. I said to the gentleman from Illinois I would withhold objection in his case. I dislike to make an objection in this case. The gentleman realizes that we have been on this bill here for 2 days. This is a very interesting subject and all that, but it has nothing to do with this particular bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, at this point I think we ought to settle the question as to whether or not this debate is out of order. In my judgment, it is not out of order because it is applicable to every appropriation bill that might be reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DIES. I think we would save time if we went ahead now.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman well knows that if we grant this extension it leaves the way open for anybody else to come up here and ask for an extension of time. We have been delayed a great deal this afternoon and we are being urged by the leadership to finish this bill as rapidly as possible.

Mr. DIES. Let me have 2 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. I am not going to object to any request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, the House is going to have to determine this question sooner or later. It is a question of what degree of proof you want. I maintain—and I am willing to submit this question to a vote of the House—that in a case where an employee has agreed or where the evidence is clear that the employee has openly associated and affiliated with a subversive organization, whether it is Nazi, Communist, or a Fascist organization, or where he has given expression to utterances in which he has denounced our form of government, in cases of that sort he ought to be stricken from the pay roll without any question. If, in addition to that, you want the same rules to apply and the same degree of proof to obtain as in a case where you were trying a man for the commission of a crime, then, of course, there will be no way to strike these people from the pay roll because, as I have said before, we have had known Communists perjure themselves before the committee and it was on the basis of perjured testimony that some of them were convicted.

I think the time is rapidly approaching when we ought to have a determination of this issue on the floor of the House as to what the House wants to do. It is a great burden on the gentleman from North Carolina and these other gentlemen. I know what they are going through, and I believe they now know what we have gone through for 5 years. Their difficulty arises, and our difficulty

has arisen, from a lack of knowledge of just what the policy ought to be. I think that a Government employee's record ought to be beyond any suspicion. He holds an appointive job, not an elective job, and it seems to me that if by his own action he has knowingly or carelessly used his name and his influence to promote, to support, and to strengthen subversive movements in this country that fact, and that fact alone, ought to be sufficient to disqualify him from the Government service. If you have any doubt about that, then I ask, how many Members of this House would permit an officer, director, or member of the German-American Bund or the Kyffhauser Bund and these various Nazi organizations to remain on the pay roll? When we exposed George Dethridge, who was on the other side of the fence, it did not take Secretary Knox 5 minutes to throw him off the pay roll. We ought to be consistent about this. If we apply it in the case of people who have been active in German-American bunds we should apply it to people who have been active in other subversive organizations.

As to whether we were right in finding these organizations subversive, I submit to you that if the Department of Justice, pursuing an independent inquiry at a time in which some of the officials there were not on friendly terms with our committee, has arrived at the same conclusion as our committee, and you have your own agency and the Department of Justice agreeing as to what organizations are subversive, and you have Government employees who were affiliated and associated with those organizations, it seems to me that evidence ought to be sufficient to remove those people from the pay roll.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. These Communists are Trotskyites. That is the same crowd that has been trying to stir up this revolution in Russia that I called attention to today. I submit they are just as dangerous as they can be and that they ought to be driven from the Federal pay roll.

Mr. DIES. I may say to the gentleman that in the 5 years of the committee's existence I have never seen a case in which anyone would come before our committee and frankly say, "I was a member of the German-American Bund, with knowledge of its subversive nature" or "I was a member of the Kyffhauser Bund and knew the nature of the organization." All of them have explanations, all of them have alibis and apologies; so that when you get into the field of explanation you have the trouble that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] is complaining about. These people are adepts in the art of testifying and alibi-ing. They have spent years in this sort of business and you will be chasing yourselves around a ring and be considering this matter for the next 10 years. The first thing the House of Representatives ought to do is to insist upon a common-sense policy as to the

character of proof you want in order to justify dismissal.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. It is a fine thing to protect the rights of an individual, but in an instance like this, does not the gentleman believe that the rights of the people of the United States to have persons in its employ in whom they have confidence should be considered likewise?

Mr. DIES. I may say that if these people had run for public office they would not have received 2 percent of the votes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, this discussion is extremely interesting to the House and I think it is important that it be taken up at this time. I simply want to lay down as my own thesis that the only thing that many of these people have in the world is a good name, and that the committee of which I am a member is going to see to it that if that good name is taken away from them it is taken away on the basis of proper evidence which can show it deserves to be taken away.

I do not care how long the committee procrastinates or how long it delays, if that is what people think we are doing. I, for one, am determined to see that no man or woman comes before that committee and goes away saying, "I have not had a fair hearing."

I commend the other members of the committee. I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], who has been extremely anxious to see some action and who has been demanding steadily that we bring in some sort of a report. Yet that gentleman and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] and the other members of this committee have worked faithfully to see what evidence there is upon which we can base a report.

I want to comment just briefly upon what the gentleman from Texas has said. I am not quarreling with my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], when I say this. The Department of Justice has prepared a list listing certain subversive organizations. That is one step in a link. The other step is to prove that the man in question belonged to that subversive organization or to find sufficient evidence to make us believe that he was trying to promote its cause.

I suggest to you that until that second step has been taken you are not ready to strike any man from the pay roll, and so far we have not been able to determine whether we do or do not find conclusive proof. I am not saying that we will not find it, and I am not saying that all the members of the committee will not be happy when that day comes to say that we have gone far enough to say that proof exists, but certainly we are only on one witness, and we are finding in that particular case

that, while it is easy to say that an organization is subversive, it is very difficult to say that because a man wrote for a magazine which had other people who were possibly Communists, writing for it, he, himself, was a member of the Communist Party.

If there came before us a single person who openly admitted that he was a Communist and was trying to strike down this Government, you would have a report to this House immediately, but that is not the situation. Those people who have admitted to that sort of a situation have disappeared from the public pay roll.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman expect any person to come before the committee and make such an admission as indicated by the gentleman?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I do not, and that is why I say you must proceed carefully and see if the information that has been presented really ties him to the cause.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman that you should be careful, but what degree of proof is the committee requiring? That seems to be the subject which concerns the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I cannot speak for any other member of the committee, but as for myself, if I am convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that this person was engaged in improper or subversive activities or was associated with people who were so engaged, I for one will be ready to condemn him. But let me say this to you, that the basis upon which this matter was presented to the House was that we would attempt to make sure that these people deserve to be stricken from the public pay roll as people unfit to serve.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. It has been intimated to me that this witness has spent a great deal of the time of the committee on irrelevant dissertations, and that the committee has felt obliged to listen to them. Is there anything to that, in the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I think the gentleman from New York will recognize that the person who perhaps should answer that is the chairman of the committee. The meetings of the committee are still executive. But I would say to the gentleman that in my personal opinion he has been dealing with matters that are not relevant. At the same time, here is a man who is trying to present his cause. He is explaining as best he can what the situation is. I am disposed to hear him through. After doing that, we may be able to establish a formula that will work better in other cases.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman feel that the burden of the 37 cases is so

heavy that one subcommittee alone cannot handle the proposition and arrive at a conclusion within a reasonable time for the Congress to act?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I think that is a very fair question, and I would answer the gentleman from New York by saying that if each of the cases as we go along takes anywhere near as much time as this first case has, then we do have a burden that is too much for one subcommittee. It is my hope and belief, however, and I think it is the hope and belief of other members of the committee, that very shortly we shall reach a formula whereby these cases will fall into certain categories. We shall find, for example, that membership in the Friends of the Soviet Union either does or does not constitute a situation that requires a man to be removed from the pay roll. Once we have come to that conclusion, then we can move rather rapidly, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and I do it for the purpose of making the observation that I am very hopeful that we shall be able to take a recess a week from next Saturday, but that hope is going aglimmering.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does that include action on the tax bill before we recess?

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope so, but I cannot guarantee it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I sincerely hope so. I think it should be done.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman.

I was hopeful that we would be able to dispose of this bill today and get through with at least the general debate on the legislative appropriation bill. I know how practically every Member, if not every Member, is looking forward to a recess, that I should like to have start a week from next Saturday. I hope my observation will not be misunderstood, but I call to the attention of the Members that there must be cooperation if we are to recess starting a week from next Saturday.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, in deference to the suggestion of the majority leader, I should like to see if we cannot make some arrangement to limit the time of debate on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the subject of this special committee close in 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, do I get 5 minutes of that time?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; three gentlemen rose.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman submitting the request said I would get 5

minutes. Is that agreeable to the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's name is on the list.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] said these gentlemen ought to have a fair trial. That is all right. Everyone should have a fair trial when accused of an offense. I wonder if he would try to get a fair trial for those so-called conspirators who were arrested a year ago, accused of sedition. They have been indicted twice or three times—it is hard to keep track of how many times. He might try to do something about that, because they are not on the pay roll of the Government. These men named by the Dies committee were or are. What is the charge made against these men? Gentlemen of the committee said that no charge had as yet been made against them. I thought the charge was that we did not want them on the pay roll any more. I did not know that they had been accused of any criminal offense.

This Congress did fire in preceding sessions 4 white men who were on the Federal pay roll. They were discharged because we did not like the things they said; because we did not like the things they wrote. We did not like their views nor what they appeared to be trying to do. We did not want them any more. We did not want to pay them. So we stopped their pay and they resigned. Then along came this other group. Among the other group, the last group, was one who was on the pay roll of the Government, of a department, which would receive an appropriation from the bill we were discussing at that time. That was Mr. Pickens. What happened? It was admitted on the floor, and you cannot dispute the proof, that he was a member of at least 3 or 4 or perhaps 10 or 20 Communist organizations. A majority of the House decided at that time that they just did not want on the pay roll a man who was a member of a Communist organization. If he did not know that at least 1 of a dozen organizations to which he belonged was Communist, then he is too dumb to be on the Federal pay roll. If he did know it then he ought to be off that pay roll. To see that he was not on was our privilege, was it not? So we kicked him off in the Committee. We kicked him off because he was Red; had Red views. Then the politicians discovered that he was black. That he was a Negro. He was a colored man. So the House, when a roll call vote came on, put him back. It was urged that by so doing, those who voted to keep him on would get the Negro vote, so-called. Some fellow outsider said to me right afterward, "You kicked him off because he was Red. You put him back because he was black. What color does that

leave you?" I went away without answering, for I did not vote to retain him and I could not, I would not give the obvious answer.

Now, here we are. We have the Dies committee. It has been in existence for 4 or 5 years. That committee has spent something like \$495,000. We have expressed our faith in the judgment, patriotism, and kind of service it has rendered to this House. Then after the Dies committee made its report and after we acted on that report in Committee of the Whole, then when we went into the House we reversed ourselves for what was charged was a political reason and expressed our lack of confidence in the Dies committee, our own committee, by putting up another committee to review the work of the Dies committee.

I venture to suggest that when this committee gets ready to report, and they suggest that these gentlemen have not had a fair trial, Mr. Pickens has not had a fair trial, someone will suggest that this subcommittee should have its opinion reviewed by the Committee on the Judiciary and we let Mr. RAMSPECK's civil service committee try him. Then, if they condemn him we will turn him over to the Labor Committee, and there it will lie buried until the end of time.

Now, if we are men capable of transacting business for our people, after we have learned, as we have learned from the report of the Dies committee, that these men or this one particular man does not believe in our form of government, that he is a member of an organization, as he admits he has been, which believes in the overthrow of our Government, which the Attorney General—think of it, the Attorney General even—has granted is an enemy of our Government, then why do we not go along with the Dies committee and get rid of this man, or why do we not just get rid of the Dies committee? Let us act like employers in private industry would act. When we know that this man is a man that we do not want let us discharge him, not because he is a colored man but because we do not want men who belong to subversive organizations. The greatest service we can do to the Negro race, to the white race, will be when we find a man of either race on the Federal pay roll who does not believe in our form of government will be to get rid of him. I say again we are not trying him for sucking eggs or for stealing chickens or stealing sheep. We just decided once, and the Dies committee did also, that we did not want him because of his associations and because of his beliefs and the things he advocated. Do we have to keep on paying him? Confidence in our Government is not strengthened by our failure to get those who belong to subversive groups off the Federal pay roll.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] is recognized.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I trust that the fact that I have continuously

opposed continuation of the Dies committee and continue to oppose it will be forgotten in the observations I have to make with respect to this controversy or debate that has arisen, and which I think has taken a turn that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] no doubt did not apprehend.

It appears now that there is a disposition on the part of some to tell this subcommittee, composed of excellent men both as to ability and as to character, how they shall conduct the affairs of that investigation in each particular instance. I trust the gentlemen will pardon me when I make the observation that regardless of what was the vote of any one of those gentlemen on the proposition of continuing the Dies committee, it will make no difference in their honesty and integrity and purpose in performing the duties assigned to them by the action of this House. I would not know where to find more patriotic, worthy, and dependable men than to go to this subcommittee in the person of the gentleman from North Carolina, my own State [Mr. KERR], in the person of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], in the person of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN], in the person of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and in the person of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS]. I could not find more reliable men, men of greater integrity and purpose than I would find there, in my humble judgment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think gentlemen mean that when charges are filed against a man by anybody, even by a grand jury of 18 men in your own county, or a majority of them, that must be accepted as guilt on the part of the person charged. We have never had such a system of justice as that since this Government was founded, and I pray God that we may never have it. In any forum, as to any charge that is made, the man who is charged will have a right to be heard and have his day in court. It is not a little thing for this Congress to find by solemn vote that a man who is an American citizen, whatever you may say about his affiliations, is unworthy to hold a position of trust or honor in the United States of America, and I pray that time never will come.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. As I understand from the gentleman's remarks and also from his past conduct in the House, he is very desirous of seeing that every person, no matter of what he is suspected, shall obtain a fair trial, and I am quite certain also that the gentleman would be heartily in favor of kicking off the public pay roll any person who he was convinced was a Communist or who had subversive intents?

Mr. FOLGER. Subversive from any point of view. Of course, I am particularly interested in the Nazi and Japanese situation now, but subversive from any point of view.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is making a fine statement on the question of subversive activities. If the gentleman will take the hearings in connection with this bill, the hearings on the appropriation bill for the Department of Justice, there are three or four pages of testimony by the Attorney General who also is considerably worried about the word "subversive." He tells us that Congress has not yet told him what subversive is, and he apparently is up against the same proposition that the committee is. I suggest that the gentleman read the hearings.

Mr. FOLGER. I may say to the gentleman in that respect that I have the fullest confidence in the ability of this committee to understand what the delegation of power is to them and to perform their duty with honesty as men and American citizens.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I purposely marked pages 20, 21, and 22 for the information of the committee and also for the information of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired; all time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Representation allowances, Foreign Service: For representation allowances as authorized by the act approved February 23, 1931 (22 U. S. C. 12), \$210,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 9, line 17, strike out "\$210,000" and insert "\$150,000."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment applies to an item of \$210,000 for so-called representation allowances and would reduce it \$60,000. I called attention to a similar item in a deficiency bill considered by the House a few weeks ago. The Chair sustained a point of order I made against the item—that I made against a paragraph that contained the item. That particular item was for \$50,000 in addition to an appropriation of \$150,000 that had already been allowed. That was for 1943 and was for so-called representation allowances. You are asking in this bill for \$210,000 under a further item for representation.

I want to direct your attention to the fact that our Government pays all of the expenses of these foreign representatives, gives them all funds that are required for all living expenses, including rent, heat, travel, and all other items. And let me remind you they are pretty high. In addition thereto, you insist on a liberal further expenditure for what you describe as entertainment. It is just an additional extravagance that we indulge in to allow our representatives and auxiliaries to put on various kinds of parties, dinners, and that sort of thing. I assume that, under the policy that is being followed, there must be a certain amount of expense required by our repre-

sentatives to pay their share on account of celebrations of different kinds. But there can be no excuse or sense in using American taxpayers' money to buy champagne, liquor, or other such stuff in order to show a friendly feeling toward the officials of the countries where our representatives are located.

If we have any extra money to spend for things of that kind we had better spend it on the poor people of those countries rather than for extravagances of this kind. I think a deeper cut should be made, but I am suggesting \$150,000 in place of \$210,000, putting it back to at least where it was last year. As far as that is concerned I do not know to what foreign representation this goes anyway. I think a great deal of it probably goes down to South America where, of course, we are putting on a lot of entertainment; but if you have got to buy their friendship by throwing cocktail parties and things of that kind then we are getting off to a rather poor start. The thing to do is at least to cut it down to \$150,000 and you will still have more than enough money for entertainment than is necessary. There is no sense in increasing this expenditure year after year. This thing started with \$50,000 not long ago; then we put it up to \$100,000, then to \$150,000, and then in the deficiency of a few weeks ago, a request was made for \$50,000 additional for this purpose. Now the committee come in for a further sum of \$210,000 described as an item for "representation."

Of course, the bill does not say what the money is to be used for; just calls it "representation" to be used by our representatives abroad. The report filed with this bill does not give any details about this item.

The hearings, I will admit, are vague. On page 117 of the hearings the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] called attention to the use of this money for entertainment, including food and beverages. The witness, Mr. Davis, was asked if he knew what the money had been spent for, and whether he could give a break-down as to the use of the money. You will not find it in the record of the hearings. The break-down of the use of that \$150,000 just is not in the record. There is a general statement in the hearings entitled "Purposes of Allowances" taken from certain regulations, but nothing about the items that go to make up the \$150,000 already spent this last year.

All I am asking this House to do is to reduce the item by \$60,000 and not make it more than it was last year.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield for a question; yes.

Mr. RABAUT. I do not doubt the gentleman's sincerity, but I should like to know what evidence the gentleman has that the money has been spent for liquor and so forth. I do not want our money spent for those things any more than the gentleman does, but I would like to know what evidence the gentleman has of it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. All right. If the gentleman will read the hearings on

the deficiency appropriation bill that passed this House just a short time ago he will find the use of funds for use of beverages, and so forth. If beverages, as used there, does not include liquor, I do not know what else it means.

Now I call attention to the hearings on the present bill on page 117, where the gentleman calls attention to the fact that this money is used for entertainment and for food and beverages. The term "liquor" was used when we discussed that item of \$50,000 a few weeks ago. I think the committee itself would practically admit that at least part of this money goes for champagne and other liquor. I really thought the chairman of the committee believed that to be a fact.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. What particular language is the gentleman referring to?

Mr. REES of Kansas. To statements made by the gentleman from Nebraska on page 115. I will ask the gentleman from Nebraska if that question was not asked?

Mr. STEFAN. It is on page 115. What was the question?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I ask if it is not a fact that the gentleman asked if it was not for entertainment and part was for beverage, and it was not denied?

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, there is no question but what a representation allowance is an entertainment allowance.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And does it not include champagne and different kinds of liquor?

Mr. STEFAN. I used the general statement that it included food and beverages. I agree with the gentleman that they should not give too many cocktail parties, and I was averse to using too much money for that and insisted on cutting it down. I think it is still a little high.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does not the gentleman think that beverages here would include champagne and other liquor?

Mr. Chairman, let me say again that in my humble judgment that, rather than turn over an additional quarter million dollars of the American taxpayers' money to our representatives to entertain the dignitaries of foreign lands, it would be a whole lot wiser and better and sensible to use it to buy food for the starving men, women, and children of those countries. It would create a whole lot more friendly feeling and understanding than to use it for extravagant cocktail parties and things of that sort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas brings up the question about representation allowances. I would ask the House to realize the tremendous increase in the cost of food today and of all sorts of entertainment which enters into a general expense account under present conditions. There was an allowance for this purpose last year of \$150,000. There was an additional allowance under a supplemental bill of \$35,000 for a 3-month period which on a yearly basis would have made the amount for this particular item \$270,000. The committee allowed the sum of \$210,000.

The State Department is in competition with all the Axis Powers all over the world wherever there is competition in matters of this kind. If it is the consensus of opinion of this House that such competition should be reduced and that the United States should be put in the disadvantageous corner, that is all right with the committee, but personally I would not approve such action.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman speaks about the high cost of food. Of course, this does not include the food supply for our representatives abroad. This is for the purpose of putting on these parties.

Mr. RABAUT. This is an entertainment program and it has to compete with the entertainment program that is put on by the opposition. I do not want to have our Department of State pushed aside and have the others lord it over our State Department. I think we ought to be broad enough to see the situation as it is, in view of the conditions that exist in the world today.

Mr. REES of Kansas. My contention is that you do not help this thing by throwing away and spending money for champagne.

Mr. RABAUT. There is a very light way you can talk about every subject. It can be dealt with in such manner as to make it look ridiculous. But, on the other hand, you have to take the facts and conditions as they are. We have something to fight about today and we are using every weapon at our command.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is there any place that a Member of the House could learn what this entertainment consists of and what it costs?

Mr. RABAUT. Well, the hearings have some information.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know about the hearings. I mean to get at the facts and know what the money is spent for.

Mr. RABAUT. We did not ask what size the meals were or what the entertainment consisted of. We thought, as figures go, that the allowances we made were such that we were very careful about the matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not know what the money was spent for

except that it comes in under the broad, general term of "entertainment"?

Mr. RABAUT. It comes in under the broad, general term of "entertainment."

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is all the gentleman knows about it?

Mr. RABAUT. We have our own people traveling all over the world today, and when visitors arrive there are expenses involved.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know about that. I go around once in a while myself.

Mr. RABAUT. If you will look on page 117, there is a whole set-up showing the purpose of the allowance.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Foreign Service, auxiliary (emergency): For all necessary expenses to enable the Department of State during the fiscal year 1944 to continue to perform functions or activities in connection with the Auxiliary Foreign Service for the performance of which, during the fiscal years 1941 and 1942, the Department of State received allocations of funds from the appropriation "Emergency fund for the President" contained in the Military Appropriation Act, 1941, including the objects for which and subject to the conditions under which such allocations were provided or expended during the fiscal years 1941 and 1942, \$2,500,000: *Provided*, That cost-of-living and representation allowances, as authorized by the act approved February 23, 1931, as amended, may be paid from this appropriation to American citizens employed hereunder.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to make an observation at this point. The personnel appearing on pages 178 to 190 inclusive are paid their salaries and expenses in this item of the bill. They are called economic analysts.

I invite your attention to the ages of many of these young men. On page 178 there is a man aged 28, named Alexander Schnee. I do not know the gentleman and have heard nothing derogatory about him. He may be a fine young boy. But it seems to me that these persons have extraordinary power and authority to recommend distribution of our toil and sweat among the countries of the world.

I point this out in the hope that the Congress of the United States will have a care and preserve for itself the control of the purse strings of the Nation so that we, rather than employees of this caliber, will decide what shall be spent in foreign countries, how much, and what for.

These economic analysts on these pages are just a few of the economic analysts of the State Department. If you will refer to the First Deficiency Appropriation bill for 1943, you will find a like list, covering probably a larger number. If you will refer to the pay roll of the Lend-Lease Administration and the Board of Economic Warfare, you will find employees of similar class and grade. I think this is a subject the Congress of the United States might well go

into. These economic analysts are making the recommendations for our movements in world affairs. When Congress blindly follows Budget requests we may sometimes be following the voices of inexperience, I'm afraid.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. The gentleman must confess that the background of these gentlemen is superb. There are a number of educated American businessmen who are going throughout all the world now negotiating business and inquiring about business, and doing business for the Government in this time of war. The gentleman will agree with me that this is a temporary set-up. It has had the approval of such men as Hull, Welles, Shaw, and Long. There is no finer corps of men in this Government than these gentlemen, and no men who are more interested in the welfare of this Government than these fine officials whose names I have just given.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, but I do not believe there is any substitute for experience. There is no substitute for age. The university of hard knocks, with its colors of black and blue, are the best credentials. I am convinced the billions of dollars that will be wrested from the taxpayers of this country should not be disposed of throughout the world on the recommendation, for instance, of Mr. Donald P. Downs, age 23, and three others from 21 to 25 years of age.

It seems to me the Congress of the United States is going to have to assume its full responsibility and reserve for itself the decisions as to where and when money is to be spent, rather than grant the power to corporations or special agencies with blank checks to do the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

COOPERATION WITH THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS

Salaries and expenses: For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of State to meet the obligations of the United States under the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations between the United States and the other American republics, signed at Buenos Aires, December 23, 1936, and to carry out the purposes of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the President to render closer and more effective the relationship between the American republics," approved August 9, 1939, and to supplement appropriations available for carrying out other provisions of law authorizing related activities, including the establishment and operation of agricultural and other experiment and demonstration stations in other American countries, on land acquired by gift or lease for the duration of the experiments and demonstrations, and construction of necessary buildings thereon; such expenses to include personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed \$125,000 for printing and binding; stenographic reporting, translating and other services by contract, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5); expenses of attendance at meetings or conventions of societies and associations concerned with the furtherance of the purposes hereof; and, under such regulations as the

Secretary of State may prescribe, tuition, compensation, monthly allowances and enrollment, laboratory, insurance, and other fees incident to training, including traveling expenses in the United States and abroad in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the act of June 3, 1926, as amended, of educational, professional, and artistic leaders, and professors, students, internes, and persons possessing special scientific or other technical qualifications, who are citizens of the United States or the other American republics, and the expenses of transportation and subsistence of employees, including the cost of transportation of their immediate families and household goods and effects in going to and returning from posts of assignment in foreign countries, and living quarters allowances, including heat, fuel, and light, in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a): *Provided*, That the Secretary of State is authorized under such regulations as he may adopt, to pay the actual transportation expenses and not to exceed \$10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, of citizens of the other American republics while traveling in the Western Hemisphere, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, and to make advances of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes; traveling expenses of members of advisory committees in accordance with section 2 of said act of August 9, 1939 (22 U. S. C. 249a); purchase (not to exceed \$10,950), hire, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled and animal-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; purchase of books and periodicals; rental of halls and boats; and purchase, rental, and repair of microfilming equipment and supplies, and colored photographic enlargements, \$4,500,000; and the Secretary of State is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to make contracts with, and grants of money or property to, governmental and public or private nonprofit institutions and facilities in the United States and the other American republics, including the free distribution, donation, or loan of publications, phonograph records, radio transcriptions, art works, motion-picture films, educational material, and such other material and equipment as the Secretary may deem necessary and appropriate, and such other gratuitous assistance as the Secretary deems advisable in the fields of the arts and sciences, education and travel, publications, the radio, the press, and the cinema; all without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; and, subject to the approval of the President, to transfer from this appropriation to other departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Government for expenditure in the United States and in the other American republics any part of this amount for direct expenditure by such department or independent establishment for the purposes of this appropriation and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority herein contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, or independent establishment to which amounts are transferred: *Provided further*, That any funds herein appropriated which may be transferred to the Federal Security Agency for the Public Health Service shall be available for the salaries and expenses of not to exceed two additional regular active commissioned officers: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$100,000 of this appropriation shall be available until June 30, 1945.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARTER: On page 29, line 13, strike out "\$4,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,000,000."

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment reduces by the sum of \$1,500,000 the funds carried in this bill for cooperation with the American republics. The committee had considerable discussion on this particular item. It was reduced somewhat below the amount allowed by the Budget. The chairman of the subcommittee and his colleagues on the majority side felt that they could not vote to reduce it below \$4,500,000. I most thoroughly and sincerely disagree with them. I think without hindering the war effort, without hindering the program that should be carried on down there at the present time, it would be ample if we gave them the sum of \$3,000,000.

Last year they had for this same purpose \$1,685,000. When we increase that to \$3,000,000 we are making a very substantial increase.

I call your attention to some of the things the State Department say they are going to do with this money. I am quite in accord with some of the things they are going to do. I will admit that the \$12,111,000 that will be spent by the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the training of pilots in South America has a direct bearing on our war effort. There are ample funds in this bill; after adopting the amendment I propose to have that program and the other necessary programs carried on. But I am unwilling to vote away the money of the taxpayers for a number of things the State Department have listed as their program for the coming year.

Here is one:

Intern training in soil conservation.

It may be very desirable for us to help the South American people and go down there and indulge in some of these activities in ordinary times when this country is not battling for its very life and existence and when the taxpayers are not carrying a heavy burden.

Here is another one:

Intern training in map and chart reproduction. Intern training in hydrographic surveying and assignment of experts. Intern training in the field of radio communication.

I think it would be very lovely for us to make the South American people more proficient over the radio, but I do not believe that is something on which we ought to spend the money that is needed so badly for war purposes at the present time.

There is a long list of these activities. Here is another one:

Fishery exploratory projects; fellowships in fishery science—

Wholly unnecessary at the present time.

Assignment of representatives to American republics.

And listen to this—the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] yesterday in the course of his remarks told you about some man we were bringing up here to give piano lessons. Here is one that has a bearing on that:

Service of collections and preparations of bibliographies of Latin-American music.

Now, we might not object to that in ordinary times with a treasury full of money, but certainly in wartime, with a treasury depleted, it is a program that we should not think of entering into at all.

Here is another item that was referred to last year:

Preparation of handbooks of South American Indians.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I always regret to take issue with my distinguished friend from California [Mr. CARTER], who has just addressed the Committee. It is always pleasant to cooperate with him, and I feel a sense of satisfaction when he and I can agree about matters. But I cannot agree with the gentleman in his proposition to reduce this appropriation 100 percent. Those representatives of the Department of State came before our committee and discussed this matter with us with great care and at great length. They also agreed fully with the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget approved, for this matter, \$6,000,000. I assume they raised the appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 because they felt that this agency was more important in this wartime than it was before. I am convinced that that assumption is right today. We will have to admit that the people of this Nation have sadly neglected their Western Hemisphere neighbors for a long number of years. We have not sought that relationship with them which would make them extremely fond of us. We were so busy here that we had other things to do and other business to attend to, and we allowed the European nations to go to the South American Republics and make friends with those people and get their trade and establish cultural relations with them. Every one of those great European activities has spent large sums of money in the last 20 years—many times the amount proposed in this appropriation—in order that they should stimulate friendship and fellowship that would give them advantage and get business from our neighboring republics.

For that reason the European people have been doing principal business with South America for a long number of years. Now, when these war eventualities came about, we realized what we had sadly neglected to do. This is a temporary measure. We propose now to go down and cultivate those people and make friends with them and tell them of our resources and our availability to do their business and to thank them for what they are doing for us now in these wartimes.

I call your attention to a clipping which I have recently cut out of a paper headed "Rio de Janeiro":

Brazilian troops were declared yesterday to be prepared to fight the Nazis on foreign soil. A high source made the announcement that two Brazilian military missions already are in North Africa, according to General Eisenhower.

By the little work we have done down there we have been able to have 8 or 10 of those nations declare themselves at war against the Axis nations. I cannot conceive of spending money to better advantage than that proposed to be spent here, namely, in teaching those people down there something of our institutions and something of our Government, and learning ourselves something about theirs.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman tell us what the Rockefeller committee does? I understood it had a duty somewhat similar.

Mr. KERR. The Rockefeller committee has a duty similar to this, but that has been practically transferred to this organization, and that is one of the reasons why the Bureau of the Budget undertook to increase the appropriation so much this year.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Could the gentleman refer me to the pages in the testimony where that transfer is described?

Mr. KERR. I do not have that before me, but what I have stated is the fact. This activity has largely taken over the activities of the Rockefeller committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I was wondering whether the committee was furnished any information at all with respect to how much money the Axis Powers might be spending in the South American countries in order to maintain good will among our South American neighbors?

Mr. KERR. I am glad to tell you. You anticipated what I had in mind when I asked to have my time extended.

These are the recorded facts given us by the Department of State itself:

The French, soon after the Franco-Prussian War, began to extend their culture abroad through the Alliance Française. French schools in foreign countries have had great appeal. French influence has been particularly strong over thought and education in the other American republics.

The German program in the other American republics has been acquiring cumulative force over two or three decades. It is estimated that since 1933 the Germans have expended \$6,000,000 on schools alone. They have used to great advantage the large German colonies in Brazil, Chile, Guatemala, and Argentina. They have built up respect for German science and scholarship, have promoted the use of their textbooks in universities and have stimulated the study of the German language.

In the other American republics there are 67 centers of Italian culture with such names as Casa Italiana, Instituto di Alta Cultura, or Societa Dante Alighieri. In 1941 the Italians were reported spending approximately \$4,000,000 a year on their cultural program.

Last summer the Japanese Government invited two Chilean newspapermen to visit Japan. Premier Tojo told one Chilean news-

paperman "we have been able to maintain neutrality with Chile and Argentina. We are going to win the war because it is not one of force against force but of spirit against spirit, in which realm the Japanese are superior." The Japanese are also carrying on an active cultural relations program in far eastern areas. It is reported that the Japanese Government has made available to the military administration 150,000,000 yen (approximately \$35,000,000) for a cultural educational program.

The British Government in 1934 established the British Council, whose budget is several million dollars a year. The British Council in spite of the war continues to award fellowships to Brazilian, Argentine, and other students for study in England. British cultural institutes are maintained in the important cities of South America.

It should be clearly understood that this activity has for its purpose the establishment of Western Hemisphere solidarity and to preserve peace in the world.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Going back to this Rockefeller activity, did I understand the gentleman to say that this activity is not being carried on any more?

Mr. KERR. The gentleman did not; I hope he did not. I said that a large portion of that activity had been transferred to this activity.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And included in this appropriation.

Mr. KERR. And I think the reason that the Budget recommends the sum of \$6,000,000 is in order to take care of that part of the Rockefeller work that was being transferred.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Can the gentleman tell us how much we are also going to spend for the Rockefeller work?

Mr. KERR. No; I cannot, because that does not come directly under our consideration. In conclusion, let me make this observation: As human beings, as men of intelligence, we know very well that in order to have a good neighbor we must cultivate our neighbor. Two men or two families can live on opposite sides of the same street, and if they fail to cultivate each other they finally come to hate each other. It is characteristic of human life; it is characteristic of national life. For 200 years we have neglected to cultivate these people, and this is the first program that has ever been inaugurated looking toward that end.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana and Mr. STEFAN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska, a member of the committee.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, there is no man in the House for whom I have greater respect than the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], who just preceded me in opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague from California [Mr. CARTER]. This is not a proposition to defeat the program of cultural relations or cooperation with the South American republics. It is a matter of endeavoring to save money and use

a little common sense. The total amount in this bill for the Department of State is over \$33,000,000. We feel it is our duty in these times of stress to recommend wherever possible a saving of money. The appropriation for this one item has jumped from a little over a million dollars to over four and a half millions.

From what has been said by my distinguished colleague you may have secured the impression that the Rockefeller organization is idle. Last year they had \$18,000,000 for the purpose discussed. They have transferred only a little of their work to the State Department.

The minority members of your subcommittee believe in doing everything we possibly can in bringing closer together the people of the entire Western Hemisphere. We are trying to do that. We do not believe we will cripple the program if some items are eliminated.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. I know my colleague wants to be fair about this.

Mr. STEFAN. Certainly I do.

Mr. RABAUT. Of the increase I would beg my colleague to remember that there are two items of the same size—one is for \$1,211,000, the other is for \$1,294,000. Most of the \$1,294,000 is for the Coordinator's office and the \$1,211,000 is for the civilian pilot training program. There is a total of \$2,505,000.

Mr. STEFAN. The Coordinator spent approximately \$18,000,000 last year and I have no information that he is not going to have sufficient funds this year. We believe in continuing the weather information service, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the aviation, the complementary crops program, and a lot of other things that we know we must have from Central and South America.

We also believe we are trying to continue a program of better friendship and better understanding, but there are some things that go beyond our comprehension.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I will not, may I call attention to the fact that I am hopeful we will get through with the general debate on the legislative appropriation bill today? I am sure that the members of the subcommittee will appreciate the situation that confronts us. I am very anxious that a week from next Saturday we may have that recess.

Mr. STEFAN. The distinguished leader will realize I am trying to cooperate with him in every way I possibly can, but this is a very important item.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, as I stated, when this bill came to us with the various things they wanted in South America, even the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee was so confused that he said:

We better send this back to the State Department and have them tell us what this is all about. We better tell them to give us a first priority on the things which they consider most important.

This came at a time when I had word from my Indian reservations in the district I represent that they wanted more police protection, and some more assistance. When the information came back from the State Department they put on as the first priority a handbook for the South American Indians. For years and years the Indians of our country have been begging us for a handbook on American Indians. Our committee in other bills always was opposed to a handbook on South American Indians until we were a little better off financially.

Another item that came back as one of high priority, an item which your committee has thrown out of the bill before the war, called for the stocking of waters in South America with fish. People in my own district have been asking us for a few minnows to stock the streams of Nebraska. We thought we ought to look after our own fishing before we launched on such a program in foreign countries.

Then there was another one involving information about labor conditions, a labor program for South America. Another had to do with the delinquency of children down there.

There are many things here that are good, but some do not make common sense. It will not make the South American or Central American people mad at us if we eliminate some of these things. They will be grateful to us for scrutinizing the items which they themselves probably would not approve.

The program of cooperation with the American republics as reflected in this appropriation and its effects on every department of our own Government should attract the attention and interest of every Member in the House.

Twelve departments of our Government have been asked to contribute their services in many of the countries south of the Rio Grande, and requests for funds for each of these departments are in this bill. The far-reaching effects of the program are shown by the original requests that the following departments embark upon the following activities in these foreign countries:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Development of complementary products.

Development of rubber production.

Intern training in agricultural economics.

Intern training in agricultural chemistry and engineering.

Intern training in agricultural extension.

Intern training in soil conservation.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Development of vital statistics in the Americas.

Civilian pilot training.

Tidal investigations.

Magnetic observations.

Seismological observations.

Geodetic surveys and intern training.

Intern training in map and chart reproduction.

Printing of hydrographic manual.

Intern training in hydrographic surveying and assignment of experts.

Publication of Spanish Edition of Manual of Tide Observations.

Gravity surveys.

Intern training in foreign trade statistics.

Maintenance and operation of radio-sonde stations in Mexico.

Intern training in meteorological science.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Intern training in the field of radio communications.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Exchange of fellows and professors. Assistance in connection with teacher-exchange and travel-grant program.

Intern training for school teachers.

Studies of Latin-American education and evaluation of credentials.

Exchange of materials on education.

Promotion of pan-American clubs.

Promotion of language teaching.

Assignment of medical and scientific personnel.

Public health fellowships.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Fishery mission to Mexico.

Fishery exploratory projects.

Fish-stocking projects.

Fishery survey of the Amazon Basin.

Fellowships in fishery science.

Cooperative investigations of strategic minerals.

Assignment of technical advisers in the field of minerals.

Materials relating to national parks and monuments.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Printing of Our Constitution and Government in Spanish and Portuguese.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Protection of childhood.

Care of dependent and delinquent children.

Maternal and child-health services.

Child welfare consultant service in agricultural investigations and extension stations.

Internships.

Intern training in the welfare of employed women.

Assignment of representatives to other American republics.

Internships.

Intern training in the administration of laws relating to labor standards.

Cooperation in connection with labor standards.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Duplication of collections for exchange with institutions in the American republics.

Assistance in the field of library science.

Archive of Hispanic culture.

Preparation and exchange of albums of recordings of American music.

Recording folk music in other American republics.

Surveys of collections and preparation of bibliographies of Latin-American music.

Guide to the official publications of Latin America.

Law guide and center of Latin-American legal studies.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Preparation of a handbook of South American Indians.

Cooperation with scientific institutions.

Cooperation in the field of social anthropology.

Mailing the International Exchanges to Argentina and Brazil.

Conservation of animal and plant life.

TARIFF COMMISSION

Intern training in the field of tariff administration, import statistics, and customs procedures.

Printing and binding.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Publication and distribution of an Inter-American Treasury Bulletin.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Translations.

Printing and binding.

Preparation of an American boundary document.

Travel of advisory committees.

Travel grants to leaders.

Professorial missions.

Travel and maintenance grants to students.

Convention for the promotion of inter-American cultural relations.

Training and education of vocational teachers and leaders.

Art and music exchanges.

Exchanges of books and other cultural materials.

Grants for American cultural institutes, libraries, and schools in the other American republics.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it looks like I am back on the red network this afternoon.

In support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from California, I may start off by saying that in 1942 for this same proposition the State Department received \$700,300. For 1943 the State Department received \$1,685,000 and for 1944 the State Department requests \$6,000,000.

In my statement yesterday I said that the committee had cut that to \$4,500,000. The pending amendment seeks to cut it down to \$3,000,000. Personally, I think it should be cut further than \$3,000,000.

I heard a lot of emphasis yesterday and today put on the fact that Germany spent from 1933 until the outbreak of the war with the United States the sum of \$6,000,000 for education. Well, that argument alone condemns the State De-

partment because in 1942 the State Department asked for only \$700,000, and that is all it received. What were they doing while Germany was spending \$6,000,000 from 1933 until about 1941, the time of the outbreak of the war? By their own argument they convict themselves.

Today they say they are waking up, but it is like trying to close the barn door after the mare has gone. It is too late. No matter how much money you want to give or to spend on these matters that have been set forth by the State Department, and many of them are ridiculous, you will not build up any goodwill that has not already been built up and that does not already exist. I heard one distinguished gentleman get up here, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS], and say that a few million dollars such as we have been talking about is chicken feed. Well, it may be chicken feed to him, but down there in the district where I come from in Louisiana four and a half or six million dollars is a lot of money. That money comes out of the pockets of the taxpayers. And may I say right here that some of these bureaucrats can think up ways for spending money faster than the taxpayers can rake up the money to pay for them with. You talk about chicken feed. Dollars make millions, millions make billions, and the taxpayers pay the whole load.

I ran into one Congressman yesterday who said, after I had finished my talk, "Jimmie, I do not agree with you." I asked him why and he said, "I do not believe in sending these men from South America to a school here in the United States at the taxpayers' expense, with the exception of one." I asked him, "Who is that?" He said, "The one to go to Harvard to study epilepsy and alcoholism." I said, "Why not keep him down in South America?" He said, "Oh, no; let him go to Harvard and when he finishes there, let him be assigned to the State Department."

The United States has stopped sending students down to South America. Why on the other hand should we pay out millions of dollars to bring their students up here?

Mr. Chairman, we are at war. Central America and South America are just as much at war as we are. We should take every available dollar, these millions, these so-called chicken-feed items, as one distinguished gentleman the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] called them yesterday, and use them to win this war. We should use that money for the war effort, and use none for these nonessential things.

As a matter of fact, South America and Central America are getting millions and billions of dollars through other departments and other branches. How can we ask for money for the Red Cross, how can we ask our people here in the United States to buy bonds when this money is being spent like this in the ways it is, for anthropology, \$116,000 in South America; for fisheries and fish-hooks the sum of \$125,000; to make a

handbook on the South American Indians, \$10,000; and for distributing periodicals, over \$100,000.

In conclusion, may I say that if we do not have the goodwill of South America yet, if we do not have the goodwill of Central America, no matter how much money we spend on these nonessentials, whether it is \$1,000,000, \$5,000,000, \$10,000,000, or \$100,000,000, we will never get it at this time.

The amount was \$700,000 in 1942, \$1,650,000 in 1943, and now for 1944 I say \$3,000,000 is ample.

You will be doing a favor for your constituents, for those soldier boys up there in the gallery, for every man in the armed forces, and for the taxpayers, and you will be doing your duty if you support this amendment to cut that appropriation to \$3,000,000, which is many, many hundreds of thousands of dollars too much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I stated yesterday that probably there are some items in this bill that on their face would appear to be objectionable. It has been pointed out that 2 years ago the State Department asked for \$900,000 and last year \$1,000,000. May I say that 3 years ago the State Department did not ask for anything to be used in South America, nor did it ask for anything 4 years ago.

Up until 3 years ago this country appeared to have no interest in South America. The only country in which we appeared to be interested was North America, until we saw the war clouds gathering on the horizon in Europe and in the Orient in 1940. Then we began to look around and take stock of our ability to face the situation. We looked into South America and we found that Japan, Germany, and Italy had become quite favorably identified there simply because they had cultivated cultural and business relations with the people of South America.

Then we realized the situation we would be in if we had to fight a war and our enemies obtained a foothold in South America. The State Department suggested we might make a few investments down there in order to find out definitely what was going on and see if it were possible to cultivate the good will of those people and have them take sides with us in what was considered to be an approaching conflict. That is the reason the State Department asked for this money.

Personally and selfishly, and let me emphasize the word "selfishly," if I looked at this from a selfish standpoint I would certainly not be in favor of some of the items carried in the bill.

It has been suggested that because we are appropriating \$33,000,000 for the State Department, the items for cultural relations should be eliminated. The advocate did not take into consideration that this is probably the greatest department of the Government, certainly one which has functions to perform equal to or superior to those of any executive department of the Government. Yet you will come in a few minutes to a provision in this bill carrying an appropriation of \$35,000,000 for one bureau in the Department of Justice, yet some complain because we are appropriating \$33,000,000 for the great State Department, about \$4,000,000 of which will be used or spent in South America.

Like my friend, the gentleman from California, I do not agree with some of the purposes for which they are to be spent, I do not think some of them will amount to much. However, I am not prepared to say that my judgment is better than that of the representatives of the State Department. They have asked for this money and said that it will be well spent and a valuable contribution to our war effort. I am, therefore, willing to take a chance on it, just as we are taking a chance on a number of other things in our war program.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman was making a very strong point of how much money Germany and Italy and some other countries had spent in South America.

Mr. HARE. No; the gentleman is mistaken. I did not mention money.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman spoke of how much attention they had given South America in the past.

Mr. HARE. Yes; that is correct, and the evidence is they spent a lot of money in their program.

Mr. CARTER. The State Department has told us how much they spent there. My understanding is that all South American countries except one have broken diplomatic relations and declared war against Germany. Does not that demonstrate to the gentleman how fruitless it is for us to go down there and spend money to gain their friendship?

Mr. HARE. No; it demonstrates to me the fruit of the expenditures of the State Department 2 years ago and the fruit of the expenditures of the State Department last year. That is what it clearly demonstrates to me. I think the gentleman had his ideas right, but he had his words wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] for 4 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to follow the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE]. He paid great tribute to the State Department. I wonder where the State Department was during the last

10 years, when all of these things that have culminated in the last few years were developing. What is the attitude of our State Department to the Falange broadcasts to South America? Has our State Department made any protest to the Spanish Government on this matter? It will be recalled time and again that the State Department permitted our doing business with Japan and Germany.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Yes.

Mr. HARE. While the State Department was permitting us to do business with Japan and with Germany and Italy and the Governments of those countries the gentleman will recall that the Congress of the United States by its action and some of its laws was doing very little business with South America.

Mr. BENDER. We have had representatives in South America for many years; official representatives of our Government, and charitable and philanthropic organizations also represented us; as a matter of fact, medical missionaries from my own church were in South America carrying on a good work. Frankly, I believe that this amendment is a desirable one. It will save us considerable money. I cannot conceive of our raising this appropriation for another boondoggle and at the same time having this subcommittee recommend a decrease of \$800,000 in the appropriation for the F. B. I. I do not know whether the gentleman desires to comment on that or not, but I think we might well increase the appropriation for the F. B. I., or leave it as requested by the Budget and not increase this item, which seems to me to be out of line with good government. J. Edgar Hoover is doing a magnificent job and should have every dime he asks for.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. If the gentleman will read the report, he will find it explicitly stated why we made the reductions. There is no question at all with the State Department. It is the manpower situation and the difficulty to fill the job that made that comparative amount in proportion to the amount of the other appropriations. It is on pages 24 and 25.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman, but I am not convinced. I am for giving the F. B. I. the \$800,000, and I am for the Carter amendment to decrease the amount of money for the South American boondoggle. I only have another minute or two. Here are a few questions my constituents are asking that I wish someone from the State Department would answer:

Has our State Department requested the Spanish Government to withdraw its concentration of troops from the border of Spanish Morocco?

What is the attitude of the State Department to Eduard Benes?

What is the attitude of the State Department to the Polish Government in exile? Specifically, to Sikorsky?

Did our State Department agree that General De Gaulle should not go to north Africa at this time?

How many political prisoners remain in jail in north Africa at this time?

How much food and oil is being shipped to Spain each month?

Several weeks ago I introduced a resolution for an investigation of our State Department appeasers and bureaucrats. Today I want to urge that the resolution be adopted, and quickly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] for 4 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. We have heard arguments put forth here about saving money. I think we are overlooking the main point in this discussion. We have established a program that embraces considerable and extensive work in South America of a vital, far-reaching account. Much opposition has been directed to certain items upon the basis that they are frivolous items. I do not believe that is so. I do believe that it is possible to modify some of the items in the bill, but when you establish a program it is important to follow it up. Some of these items may not be possible of completion during the coming year, but we know that such funds as are not expended revert to the Treasury. Certainly the State Department is not going to seek out ways to use these funds just for the amusement of spending the taxpayers' money. I think when we treat this matter in a frivolous manner we are doing an injustice to the State Department, to ourselves as representatives of the people, and we are placing our officials at a great disadvantage. We all know what Germany, Italy, and Japan have been doing for years in Latin America. We recognize the inroads they have made there, and we should realize that we will have to do twice as much work in order to counteract their insidious influence. We have been told that our enemies have been down there for 25 years, and not only have they set up extensive business interests and schools but they have also intermarried. We know when ties, however to our disadvantage, are that close, we are not going to counteract them merely by spending a few million dollars in a hurry, in good old get-rich-quick-Wallingford style, by saying, "Here is money; we are your friends." That is not the point. I think our Latin-American program is based on solid substantial ground.

It is important for us to bring students to our universities so that we may have an exchange of cultures. I am in favor of this program being extended over a period of years, and I am convinced it will take years before we attain our proper place in the sun of South America. If we do not fully support the program of the State Department, and support it now, we will slip back to our former unworthy place, and all of the scanty progress that we have made will

be lost. Our failures will be magnified because these folks will regard our program as merely theoretical. I do not know why they declared war or did not declare war upon our common enemies; I do not know whether it was from a selfish or a patriotic motive, but I prefer to believe that the motive was patriotic.

I do not believe we ought to tie the hands of our State Department in any way. When the success of a broad constructive program is at stake, a program which is an essential part of the larger program of winning the war and the peace, I repeat, this is no time to indulge the luxury of ignorance and prejudice in ill-advised frivolity or penny-pinching frugality. It behooves us to be more generous than we ordinarily would be. I know it imposes a penalty upon our people, but we are in a war that is affecting every single home. I would rather spend millions of dollars than lose the life of one American boy because of something that we should have done and failed to do.

I hope that this amendment will not be adopted. After all, if the money is not expended it will simply go back into the United States Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] has expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to cut the amount carried in this portion of the bill from \$4,500,000 to \$3,000,000. In other words, it proposes to save the American taxpayer \$1,500,000. Of course, in supporting this amendment I do not for a minute wish to be understood as decrying the effort to solidify and render permanent the good will that exists now between this Nation and virtually all of the Central and South American republics, but we cannot buy victory. We have been liberal with every country in the world to the degree of prodigality. In considering this effort to save this sum of money for the American taxpayers, let us just have in mind a few facts. A few days ago we raised the debt limit of this country to \$210,000,000,000. That means that before this war is over this Nation shall have spent in the war on its own behalf and that of its allies all of the accumulated wealth of this Republic.

Just what degree of care should a public official exercise in the discharge of a public duty on behalf of the people he represents? The law sets the standard for an official in the discharge of his official duties. It says he must use a degree of diligence which exceeds that of a prudent man in the discharge of his own private affairs. There ought to be some limit. When war comes in the door, economy, good judgment, and a lot of other good things go out the window.

Of course, we are going to win this war, but I am not convinced for 1 minute that any victory will come to us by the expenditure of this \$1,500,000 in South America. We have done a lot of good down there and we are getting a lot of good things that we need. We are getting tin. We are getting copper, we are getting quinine, we are getting bauxite,

and if necessary we can get other things; but that is a business proposition. We have gone into the social phase of this thing. I am not going to say that we ought not to do that. They say that when a man is in wine he will tell the truth, and that a banquet is sometimes a feast of reason and a flow of soul, and that one way to a man's intellect and his judgment is through his stomach. We have made liberal allowance for all of that, but we do not want to leave the impression on the minds of those people that we do not have any sense; that we are just a Nation spendthrift; that we are throwing away our wealth like a drunken sailor. All over the world we are pouring out the wealth of this Nation like sand, and the blood of its boys like water. Let us stop short of absolute bankruptcy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] is recognized.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. We all realize that friendship is the cement that binds peoples together. We realize that this four and a half million dollars is for the purpose of purchasing that friendship. Nations are like men, because they are groups of men. As a man, I have never known an individual whose friendship I have had to purchase whose friendship has been of any value. I think that this would apply also to South America.

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I am for the old-line agencies, as I said yesterday. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], cutting \$1,500,000 from this item, is a good amendment and will not harm the State Department or its integrity in any way. I am for it. I think this amendment will leave in the cultural relations program all that is necessary for the State Department to weld its share of the friendship between the United States and the South American countries.

I hope the amendment will be adopted almost unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, you cannot do what is being proposed here without disrupting the good-neighbor policy. If you vote for this amendment, you are doing an offensive act to the good-neighbor policy in the Western Hemisphere. You are not going abroad to do it. You are doing it right here in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes, I yield.

Mr. CARTER. I want to know whether or not the good-neighbor policy has already been offended by reason of the fact that the subcommittee cut the amount down to \$4,500,000 from \$6,000,000?

Mr. RABAUT. No. This proposition is brought to the official body of Congress. Congress is the representative body of the people. If you desire to convey the idea that we are now embarking on a wartime honeymoon, you are certainly playing into the hands of those who have sought to sell and have succeeded in selling the Axis proposition south of the Rio Grande. That is No. 1.

No. 2: No one questions the statesmanship of Cordell Hull or the African front, and the same great leader of the Department of State carries this message to you that is contained in this bill.

There has been much ridicule about the handbook on the American Indians. Scientists throughout the Americas, including teachers from 200 different universities, have earnestly sought the compilation of this data on the American Indian. The handbook is now in its third year of preparation. Sixty percent of the manuscript, maps, photographs, and drawings are in the editor's hands. The remainder is so near completion that the entire work could be assembled in a little more than a year. Thirty thousand dollars has already been spent on the project, and now it is contemplated to disregard the investment and the work that has been done by cutting down the \$12,000 that would be allowed.

Moreover, there have been 90 contributions to this one book, and I ask the gentleman from New York particularly to listen: 47 in the American republics in Central and South America, and 43 in the United States.

These contributors went at the job so promptly and enthusiastically on the invitation extended that they are well in advance of the program and have really cut down the time for the work as originally anticipated by over a year. I could go on and tell you how the Germans, the Italians, and the Japanese have been active in South America, but it is really difficult to appraise the great inroads that have been made there. I am surprised that the gentleman from California of all people should make the request that this fund be cut, for my distinguished and personal friend accompanied me on a recent trip to 17 of those countries.

I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 89, noes 78.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. CARTER. The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were ayes 113 and noes 86. So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, War Division: For all salaries and expenses in the District of

Columbia and elsewhere necessary for the enforcement of acts relating to the national security and war effort and in connection with the registration and control of alien enemies, including the employment of experts; supplies and equipment; printing and binding; travel expenses, including attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; stenographic reporting services by contract or otherwise; books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers (not exceeding \$4,000), \$800,000, of which not to exceed \$100,000 may be expended for personal services without regard to the civil-service and classification laws.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the language on page 36 beginning with the word "of" in line 13 and extending to the end of line 15 and ask the gentleman from Michigan why it is proposed to exempt \$100,000 from the civil-service and classification laws.

Mr. RABAUT. That is for an emergency in the Attorney General's office.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I should like to know what it is, to see whether it is justified or not. I have not been able to find anything in the hearings about it.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. HARE. It is my understanding that it is for the employment of special counsel in special cases by the Department of Justice in the war program. It is an appropriation that has been carried heretofore.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I have not been able to find anything about it in the hearings.

Mr. HARE. It has been carried from year to year in the same language.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I have no objection whatever to an item exempting only the classification law, but I see no necessity for exemption from the civil-service law, especially when we are now operating under the War Service Regulations.

Mr. RABAUT. This item has been carried for several years. If my colleague wishes to press his point of order that is his privilege, of course.

Mr. ROWE. Do special counsel fall under the jurisdiction of the civil service?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Oh, yes; all employees now come under civil service procedure. Attorneys were just recently put under civil service.

Unless there is some real emergent reason for it I am not disposed to pass it by.

Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the language referred to is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan concedes the point of order. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction of buildings and facilities: For construction, remodeling, and equipping buildings and facilities for penal and correctional institutions and for all necessary expenses incident thereto, including the acquisition of a site, there is hereby authorized to be transferred to this appropriation such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Attorney General and the head of any department, agency, or corporation of the United

States as reimbursement for the National Training School for Boys or for any other penal and correctional facilities appropriated for under this heading, transferred to any other Government department, agency, or corporation, to continue available until expended.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language on page 50 in lines 12 to 23 on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. It is very bad practice to provide an indefinite appropriation without knowing what it is to be used for or anything about it. It is entirely illegal and not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RABAUT. No; we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Departmental salaries and expenses: For personal services (not to exceed \$1,354,480) and other necessary expenses of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce at the seat of government in performing the duties imposed by law or in pursuance of law; newspapers (not exceeding \$1,500), periodicals, and books of reference; contract stenographic reporting services; fees and mileage of witnesses, and other contingent expenses in the District of Columbia, \$1,409,000: *Provided*, That expenses, except printing and binding and traveling expenses, of field studies or surveys conducted by departmental personnel of the Bureau shall be payable from the amount herein appropriated.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by **Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN**: On page 68, line 13, after the word "appropriated", insert "*Provided further*, That no part of the appropriation in this paragraph shall be used for inquiries or investigations relating to dairy products, or for promotional activities, inquiries, or investigations in connection with oleomargarine, 'filled milk,' 'filled' cheese, and other pretended substitutes for dairy products."

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [**Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN**]?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish the gentleman would not ask for the additional time. We have another bill coming up, and the hour is late.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I had a tentative understanding with the gentleman from California that I would have 10 minutes today instead of taking the time yesterday.

Mr. RABAUT. I may say to the gentleman there is not a thing in the bill about this matter.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request temporarily.

Mr. RABAUT. Has the gentleman an amendment pending?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request temporarily.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the amendment which I have just proposed, may I say that I believe that there is a definite conspiracy on within the administration to permanently injure and sabotage the dairy industry of this country? In 1940, the consumers counsel in the Department of Agriculture staged a Nation-wide radio broadcast urging people to eat oleomargarine, leaving the inference that oleo was just as good as butter. This was followed by a ruling of Paul V. McNutt, in charge of the Pure Food and Drug Division, which provided a new formula for oleo to make this product, as nearly as possible, have the same nutritive value, taste, and smell as butter. And, now, we have the Bureau of Domestic and Foreign Commerce putting on a promotional campaign, at the expense of the taxpayers, urging the use of oleo, filled milk, and filled cheese, and attempting to discredit butter and other genuine dairy products. **Mr. E. E. McCleish** is the Chief of the Marketing Laws Unit in this Bureau. I will have something to say about him and his predecessor, **Mr. Paul T. Truitt**, who resigned a few months ago to take on, as I have heard, a \$40,000 a year job as the head of the Oleomargarine Institute.

These officials in the Bureau of Domestic and Foreign Commerce, and their associates, under the direction of **Mr. Truitt**, now the head of the Oleomargarine Institute, undertook to make an investigation which sought to discredit dairy products and to boost the use of oleomargarine, and other products like filled cheese and filled milk, both of which are now being sold contrary to law.

I have before me the results of the investigation, which consist of one publication of 308 pages and another of 55 pages boosting the merits of oleo and filled milk and cheese, and attempting to tear down genuine dairy products. These publications have been mailed out over the country by the Bureau and by **Mr. Truitt**, former chief, and now the high-priced executive of the Oleo Institute. All of this at the expense of the taxpayers.

In my opinion, **Mr. Truitt** did such a splendid job, as chief of the Bureau, in advertising oleo, that he was offered and did accept the high salaried position as head of the Oleo Institute. I estimate that he gave the industry at least \$10,000,000 worth of free advertising—all at the expense of American taxpayers. After he resigned to take on his new job, **Mr. McCleish** took over, and it appears to me that **Mr. Truitt** still has considerable to say about the running of the Bureau when it comes to the products covered by my amendment.

There is no reason why the taxpayers should be called upon to pay for promotional work or advertising for any product or commodity. I have therefore offered this amendment to prohibit the use of any money appropriated by this section for inquiries and investigations of dairy products, and also to stop all promotional activities, inquiries, and investigations with reference to oleomar-

garine, filled milk, filled cheese, or any other pretended substitute for dairy products.

There will be a shortage of butter in the United States this year. Last year the production for civilian use was approximately 1,800,000,000 pounds. The Army and other governmental agencies will take around 30 percent of that butter, which leaves approximately 1,200,000,000 pounds for domestic consumption. When you deduct the amount that four or five million farmers will produce when they churn butter due to the rationing of butter, you will find approximately 1,000,000,000 pounds of butter left for civilian use as against 1,800,000,000 last year. I can see good reasons why the few who are engaged in the manufacture of oleomargarine want to have the Government promote their product, and I have no objection to people eating oleo. I do not want to be misunderstood in that respect.

You can buy and eat all the oleomargarine that you want. If the people know what it is, they may buy it, but we do not want it sold for butter, and we think it is wrong for any governmental money to be used for advertising or for any agency of the Government to promote its sale.

The sale of oleomargarine has gone up by leaps and bounds during the last 2 years or ever since the departments undertook this campaign to promote the sale of it. I have the figures here from the Department showing the sales of oleo to be around 72,000,000 pounds in January. At that rate, if it continues for the rest of the year, and we expect it will because of the butter shortage, you can realize that the total will be close to 1,000,000,000 pounds in 1943.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman says that oleomargarine is sold as a substitute. Is that not a legitimate way to present the subject?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We want it sold for what it is. Let the people know what it is. If it is oleomargarine, and the people know it, I have no objection. But the people should not be deceived and made to believe that it is butter or just as good as butter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. My understanding is that that report on oleomargarine was started by the W. P. A. and finished by the Department of Commerce. Am I correct in that?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad the gentleman called that to my

attention. It says in this 308-page booklet that the study of the food industry was initiated by Mr. Paul T. Truitt, recently resigned Chief of the Marketing Laws Division of the Bureau of Domestic and Foreign Commerce. He is the man who did such a good job in advertising these synthetic substitutes that he was given a job at \$40,000 a year as the head of the Margarine Institute.

A legal research was conducted by Miss Edith N. Cook, chief attorney and labor analyst for the unit, and her associate counsel, Mr. Burt W. Roper, and Mr. John H. McLean. The Los Angeles staff of the Market Laws Survey contributed importantly in checking and charting the statutory restrictions. The economic section was conducted by Dr. Richard H. Rush, head of the economic staff of the unit, and his associate, John E. Kane. They do not give any credit to the W. P. A., although I know the W. P. A. assisted in this investigation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They started it, I think.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The Bureau takes full and complete credit for having compiled this publication and for undertaking the program to advertise oleo and to bring about its increased sale to the people.

I was saying here that the sale of oleo has increased by leaps and bounds. Seventy-two million pounds were sold in January of this year. If it goes along at the same rate, the manufacture and sale of oleo will run close to 1,000,000,000 pounds for 1943, which will be about the same as the sale of butter available for consumption by the people in this country.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. In this very book about trade barriers that the gentleman holds in his hand and which deals with the subject of—

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I cannot yield for a speech. The gentleman can bring that out in his own time.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman wants to be fair in his statement?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will be fair.

Mr. RABAUT. There was no increase whatever in the consumption of butter when they put the tax on oleo. This is right in the findings in this book.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The tax has been on oleo for many years, but, in addition, this bureau has undertaken to make 10 or 15 recommendations, which appear in the back part of their book, recommending what should be done in Congress to change the laws and what should be done to secure the repeal of laws in the respective States. They are setting themselves up as supermen to dictate to us what shall be done in this country. We want no traffic with that kind of synthetic dictatorship.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield. Mr. JENNINGS. How much money belonging to the people of this country

has this set of bureaucrats used in order to destroy the dairy industry of this Nation?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have no idea how much money they have used, but I can tell the gentleman from Tennessee that if the objective of these officials is achieved, and they are trying to get the American people on a permanent oleo diet, that will drive the people away from butter. The O. P. A. has helped out on it. They require only 5 points to get a pound of oleo, whereas they require 8 points to get a pound of butter.

Mr. JENNINGS. What was the reward of the man who thus sabotaged the dairy industry of this country at the hands of the oleo interests?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The reward for Mr. Truitt, the chief of that division, was that he got this job as the head of the Oleomargarine Institute at around \$40,000 a year. In other words, he gave them \$10,000,000 worth of advertising at the expense of the taxpayers.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. How many copies of this book were delivered to the Oleo Trust for distribution at Government expense?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not know how many copies they got, but I tried to get two copies and had to raise particular Ned even to get these and a few extras from Mr. MacLeish.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In conclusion let me ask your support of my amendment so that we may stop this iniquitous practice of spending the taxpayers' money for the promotion of any product, and forever prevent a bureau chief from feathering his own nest at the expense of the people.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me the book to which the gentleman has been referring, Trade Barriers in the Food Industry. There is nothing in this bill, for the Department of Commerce for the particular matter that is being suggested under the pending amendment, so it is all water over the dam and we are just talking about it. It is all finished.

Besides this book that was referred to by the gentleman from Minnesota, I have here letters from different war agencies commending this study. It was originally started in the W. P. A. and then inherited by the Department of Commerce. These letters of commendation that I have are from Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, of the War Department; Ralph A. Bard, Assistant Secretary of the Navy; Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War; Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board; and Joseph B. Eastman, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation. There are several others, and I could go on naming them. All these letters praise the activity that has been undertaken.

The gentleman from Tennessee just now said that the dairy industry is being

ruined. Why, Mr. Chairman? Because it is unable to fill its orders. Of course, people must have something in the form of substitutes for food. Naturally they are using these other products. If the orders can be filled, I know of no one who does not prefer butter and milk, if he can get it. But if these products are unobtainable, it is the most natural thing in the world for such a study to be made.

Under a study, started in the W. P. A., this matter came to light. Now it is completed. It is water over the dam, and I see no reason for having a continuing discussion about it, especially at this late hour.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this subject close in 15 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman mean on this amendment?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, during yesterday's debate on this bill the Chair gave me permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD full information, not only on this particular book known as Trade Barriers for Food Industry, but also approximately 25 other books, which were printed as a result of research done by a committee from various departments of the Government. I wish to advise my friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] that I have been told that the gentleman who did some of the work on this particular book was employed in the Department of Commerce and since that time I understand, also, he has been employed by the oleo people.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. He was the Chief of the Division.

Mr. STEFAN. That is correct. He has since left the Department of Commerce.

I agree entirely with my colleague from Minnesota that we who come from butter-producing States are not so much concerned about the substitutes as we are about presenting to the public an inferior material, to be labeled as butter. We do not want the people fooled. We want them to know when they are eating butter and when they are eating substitutes.

I suggest that Members read the RECORD of yesterday. That gives a full, unbiased report of the publication of the various books in question. Here are about 25 of them, and practically every one was paid for with W. P. A. funds. To give the gentleman from Michigan some information about the history of the books, which the producers of milk, cream, and butter object to, they were paid for by W. P. A. funds.

The Department of Commerce spent no money in the preparation of them except a small amount on one book on trade barriers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words. I call the attention of the House to the fact that this amendment comes to us strictly as a proposition to destroy any information that the public might get in regard to the value of oleomargarine as human food. The amendment is not here for the purpose of saving money. The gentleman who has just preceded me, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], talks about the improper publication of books. He did not tell you that the books relate to a great number of subjects, not simply oleomargarine.

Mr. STEFAN. I did not say "improper publication of books."

Mr. POAGE. Then I will simply say the publication of books. The books about which he complains relate to the whole question of interstate barriers. The amendment relates to getting information about oleomargarine, and the gentlemen who have discussed the subject have referred to what they call the oleomargarine monopoly. Oleomargarine is made all over the Cotton Belt, all over the Soybean Belt, and all over large sections of the United States. It is not produced by a monopoly. At least there is sufficient competition to keep the price far below the price of butter. It is not made altogether out of one product. It is made out of cottonseed, out of soybean oil, out of many crops grown in the great agricultural regions of this Nation, and it is being consumed by all the people of America who can get it. Even if the public wanted butter they cannot get it and the very gentlemen who are unable to furnish the people of America with the butter which they tell us the people want are unwilling for the people to have any substitute. They say they do not want to deny the people a good spread, they say they simply want the people to know the difference. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] made a fine argument. He said all he wanted was that the people might know whether they were buying oleomargarine or butter. I want them to know also, and the very proceedings against which they now inveigh convey that information to the public. When the housewife goes to a store and pays five ration points for oleomargarine as against eight for butter, you can be mighty sure that she knows whether she is getting butter or oleomargarine. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] think that oleomargarine is so superior to butter that it should require more ration points? If he really believes that butter is so much better than oleomargarine then surely he would want butter to command a higher point value. If those people who do not want the people of America to have a cheap spread for their bread are sincere in saying they want the people to know the difference between oleomargarine and butter, they have never had an opportunity better than they have today for more clearly understanding the difference between oleomargarine and butter in what the O. P. A. is doing at this moment.

Why, then, continue your complaint about agencies of the Government doing the very thing you say you want them to do? Oh, the gentleman from Tennessee talked about the oleomargarine monopoly. Who has got a monopoly in this country? Who wants to keep the people from knowing what the product is that they are buying? Those of us who want the people of America to buy any food that is wholesome and pure that the American farmer can produce, whether he belongs to a favored group or whether he belongs to the great masses of farmers who produce general crops throughout this Nation, those of us who want the poorest as well as the most wealthy of this country to be able to buy a bread spread, are glad to see an agency of the Government show the housewife whether she is buying oleomargarine or whether she is buying butter. The people of America have long known the difference. Let them buy what they want to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, personally I had been hopeful that we would not have this battle of oleo and butter during the present war; but that we could have that afterward. It seems, though, that when there is a war on, many groups, many people think that is the opportune time to sell their particular brand of medicine oil. The Commerce Department seems to be anxious to add fuel to the controversy. We should stop it.

For many years I have followed what has been done on these substitutes. If the substitute people want to promote any product let them use their own money instead of the public's.

The question is not whether oleo is as good as butter; the question is why we should be spending time and money during the war or any other time for this purpose. We do not want the Commerce Department spending time and money on this proposition. We have the Department of Agriculture; we have agricultural colleges and land-grant colleges scattered all over the United States. That is the place to study foods. We should not be trying to run it through the Department of Commerce. Since the Agriculture Department can carry on this experimental work and it is equipped to do so, we should let them do it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In answer to the gentleman from Texas, I might say that my amendment does not in any way interfere with the sale of oleomargarine or butter. All it does is to simply stop the expenditure by the Department of Commerce of any of the money appropriated in this bill to carry on promotional processes or investigations with reference to either dairy products, oleomargarine, or filled milk or filled cheese.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. We should support the

motion of the gentleman from Minnesota. We should discontinue the appropriation, as the program is absolutely without merit.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. As I understand it, when you patronize the time-honored institution of the cow that gives milk, to take care of the cottonseed of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], who has just spoken so eloquently and so feelingly about that, you can put the cottonseed through the cow and get milk as against putting the cottonseed through a machine and get oleomargarine.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. But that does not solve the problem before us. The question for us to decide is whether we want to continue an agency to promote dairy substitutes. I hope you will support the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think it is poor practice for any public official on the public pay roll to use his efforts in trying to promote the sale of any kind of product so that he can get a job as head of the institution.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think we all agree to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] said you put this cottonseed through the cows and get butter and if you put it through a machine you get oleomargarine. When you put it through the machine and get oleomargarine you do not get tuberculosis, anthrax, and all these other infectious and contagious diseases that some of these cows carry.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I can qualify as an expert on this subject or not. I happen to have two or three milch cows at my home, and I also happen to grow cotton. I get butter, milk, and clabber cheese from the cows. I guess I get oleomargarine from the cottonseed. So I think I can approach this from an unbiased standpoint. But I do want to make this observation.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. In just a minute, because I may not get an opportunity to make this observation. I have had a number of complaints recently about an O. P. A. order. Down in my country where other farms are about the size of mine, it has been customary for these farmers to keep a cow or two and sell their butter every week throughout the year. That is where the farmer gets his spending money. He has not been able to get rich at it, but he has been able to keep things going. O. P. A. orders have recently been issued to the effect that such a

farmer cannot take his butter up to the little village and sell it where he has been accustomed to sell it for 10 or 20 years without getting some kind of a ticket or coupon. Consequently he does not sell it. What I want to know is this: Are the dairy people responsible for that order or is it the oleomargarine people? Whenever I find out who is responsible for it, then I will be ready to start cussing.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I may say to the gentleman that the O. P. A. intellectuals, key policy makers, are the ones who are responsible for it, and the butter and dairy industry regret it just as much as the gentleman does. We are trying to get it changed.

Mr. HARE. I appreciate that, but I say to the gentleman that I did not hear anything about it in his speech. I am serious about this because I imagine the custom prevails in practically every farming section of the country. It interferes not only with the operations of the small farmer, but it also interferes with a lot of people living in small towns and even the larger cities who have developed a taste for cow butter and, therefore patronize these small farmers. They know the difference between cow butter and butter substitutes. They like butter and they like to buy it from these farmers, but since they cannot get it they are disappointed and dissatisfied and both the farmer and the customers are kicking like "old Harry," and I cannot blame them. I get letters of protest nearly every day and I want to find out whether it is the oleomargarine people or the dairy people influencing the actions of the O. P. A.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 94, noes 85.

So, the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 68, line 3, after the word "exceed", strike out "\$1,354,580" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,260,000"; and on page 68, line 10, strike out "\$1,409,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,309,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to take out of the bill money that was spent by the crowd that pulled off this performance last year. Just to show you the kind of job they thought they were doing I call attention to some of their performances. Thousands of copies of these documents, like this one entitled "Trade Barriers in Food" and this other smaller one on oleomargarine, were printed at Government expense and turned over to the Oleo Trust for distribution. To me it is the height of ridiculousness for any Government agency to go out and try to destroy one industry or build up an-

other. I believe that people who indulge in this sort of thing very evidently for their own profit ought to be put in their proper place, and that is off the Government pay roll.

Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment to save the \$100,000 that was spent in this way. They were so ashamed of the documents they had put out that they tried to prevent the dairy industry from getting copies of them and refused to furnish copies to representatives of the dairy industry when the representatives asked for them after they had turned over to the Oleo Trust thousands of copies of free distribution.

Is it not about time we put them where they belonged and cut out this \$100,000 which is unnecessary because they say according to the chairman that they are not doing that job right now?

I hope this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 101, noes 95.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 117, noes 96.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 68, after line 13, insert the following paragraph:

"Field Office Service, for salaries (not to exceed \$397,000) and all other expenses necessary to operate and maintain regional, district, and cooperative branch offices for the collection and dissemination of information useful in the development and improvement of commerce throughout the United States and its possessions including foreign and domestic newspapers (not exceeding 300), periodicals, and books of reference and the transference of householding goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1941 and regulations promulgated thereunder, \$430,000."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, the Commerce bill for last year carried the amount included in this amendment, namely \$430,000 for the maintenance of 30 field offices. These offices have existed for 30 years, they are maintained, manned, and operated by trained commercial personnel. Virtually all of this money is for salaries for the maintenance of those offices. There is one such office in each Federal Reserve city and 18 additional offices scattered over the country in 22 States of the Union.

When this bill came from the Budget Bureau that item was deleted. This amendment proposes to restore that item as contained in last year's bill and I certainly hope it will commend itself to the best thinking of this body.

There is some short-sighted economy and I think this is an example. What virtue is there in setting up these offices

under the Board of Economic Warfare at some later date because you do not save any money as you simply disrupt and destroy trained personnel. Every day restrictions are going on commerce—block exchange, blacklists, fund control, block money, everything to make things difficult for the business and industrial men of the country. After all, how are we going to pay this enormous war debt? We could repudiate, we can devalue, but there is one and only one way in which it must be paid and that is by the sweat of everyone's labor and by the exchange of goods and services. That is the way we shall pay the war debt. If that is the case, then why not help industry, why not help the businessman of the country first to assemble information which goes into the Department of Commerce and, secondly, to make information available to all the businessmen of the country?

The hearings will show that in the year 1942 these offices received 434,000 calls for consultations from businessmen on problems that have developed as a result of the war, as a result of restrictions, as a result of the enactments of this very Congress. Now, we propose to delete that item and make the job of the businessman infinitely more difficult. With all this control, exchange blocking, international difficulties, how are we going to promote the flow of international commerce unless we offer some help to these people?

The other day, to be exact on the 26th of March, the preliminary estimate for the Office of Censorship came to the Appropriations Committee. Do you know what it asked for? It asks for an appropriation of \$29,000,000 with which to put 13,852 people on the pay roll. If we have money enough to maintain a censorship office and keep 13,000 people on the pay roll, surely we have \$430,000 in the Federal exchequer for the development of our trade and commerce, the interchange of goods and services, wherein lies the one and only hope of ever meeting the enormous debt that will be piled up as a result of this war and that will take this country out of the valley of the shadow. This item ought to be restored and I respectfully submit you should support this amendment.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. Chairman, I am just as solicitous of the welfare of the small businessman and for business generally as the gentleman who preceded me here or any other member of the committee. I believe that they should be given help, aid, and assistance, but I call your attention to the fact that the Bureau of the Budget took this item out of the bill. This subcommittee called the representative of the Budget who handled this appropriation before the subcommittee and asked him if he had any personal knowledge in regard to it. He said he had. He had made a personal investigation of a number of these offices. We asked him in regard to that investigation. He said he had visited the offices, he had checked on their work,

and he was firmly convinced that this expenditure for this purpose should not be made at the present time.

Mr. RIVERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Was the gentleman satisfied with that statement? Did you not put your own investigators on this to determine whether or not it was necessary?

Mr. CARTER. I may say to the gentleman that we did put our own investigators on this, but they have not yet reported.

Mr. RIVERS. The Bureau of the Budget statement has not been satisfactory to your committee up to this time?

Mr. CARTER. No; that was not the reason why we put the investigators on. We were satisfied that at this time these officers should not receive the appropriation. We want to know whether or not they should ever be continued again and the result of the special investigating committee that was appointed under House Resolution No. 69 will determine that. I may say to my good friend from Illinois who offered the amendment and for whom I have a profound respect, that he was the one largely instrumental in providing a corps of special investigators for the Appropriations Committee. Now, we are using the machinery that he advocated, and I say that in the meantime the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget and the recommendations of this subcommittee should stand.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Is it not true that the administration is attempting to substitute the Board of Economic Warfare for the activities of the Commerce Department in foreign affairs as well as the State Department?

Mr. CARTER. I do not believe that is true, so far as these officers are concerned, because the Board of Economic Warfare does not have offices established around over the country at the present time. I understand that at one time they did have some offices, but they have been closed, and I may say in passing, too, that we called a representative of the Board of Economic Warfare before this committee and asked him if that Board used these offices. He said, "Yes; we use them some." When we suggested, or asked, "How about transferring a part of your appropriation for maintaining these offices?" he said, "No; we would not want to do that."

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman tell us what these branch offices do? I understand they give advice at about \$1 per advice—400,000 pieces of advice to businessmen. What else do they do and what is the nature of their advice?

Mr. CARTER. They aid and assist and I think they do render some assistance to business.

Much has been said about the small businessman. I have one of these offices in the region in which I live, and I have received numerous telegrams requesting me to vote to put these offices back into the appropriation. I have no doubt but that many of you have.

Here is a real test now as to whether or not we are for economy. It is a test with me as to whether or not I am for economy. I am going to stand for economy notwithstanding the fact that one of these offices is in my vicinity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the hour is getting late. I move that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment on the desk which intended to do the same thing as the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. However, Mr. DIRKSEN's amendment has precedence over mine since he is a member of the Appropriations Committee. Mr. DIRKSEN's and my amendment have the same objective in view, that is, restore the field offices of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has so aptly said: There are 30 regional offices and a number of local offices throughout the Nation. These offices give a great deal of information to business, wherever they be. In my home town of Charleston there is a great deal of activity for the Army and the Navy. The intelligence offices of both of these branches of the service utilize this office with a great deal of regularity and a great deal of success, as they have attested by copies of letters in my possession.

These offices give the small businessmen a wealth of information. The other day I was in Charleston and numbers of these small businessmen who had heard of the prospective closing of this office at the end of the fiscal year were very much disturbed. They said:

The Congress has set up a Smaller War Plants Corporation. Every day something appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about keeping small business alive. If you close up our local office of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, our local men will have no place to turn to get this information which is so vital to them.

Our people cannot get priorities for traveling on the railroad. They cannot get priorities for coming up here in their cars. They can ill afford to come to Washington at such great expense to get information when these local offices are furnishing them with such a wealth of information so satisfactorily.

I should like to read you some of the things which the services have written me in this regard. They have sent me copies of letters which they in turn have sent to the regional offices about the services of the Domestic and Foreign

Commerce offices throughout the country.

First, I quote one from the Naval Intelligence, and one from the Military Intelligence second:

1. The writer wishes to express his appreciation and that of the district intelligence officer, Sixth Naval District, for your efforts and the efforts of the district managers in the offices of your department in the Sixth Naval District, in furnishing the lists of those persons speaking or reading foreign languages who may act as translators or interpreters for Naval Intelligence. The writer fully realizes that the compilation of such a list required a great deal of time and effort on the part of all concerned and such will be of great value to Naval Intelligence.

The writer is enclosing herewith copies of this letter for each district manager and will greatly appreciate your forwarding it to them.

2. In compliance with the request of the military intelligence director, Headquarters Fourth Service Command, Atlanta, Ga., you have maintained liaison with the writer and supplied him with periodic reports of the conditions and changes therein of the port of Charleston, with reference to congestion of railroads leading into the port and other facilities.

The writer has found the confidential information furnished by your office to be accurate and complete in every detail. Both for himself and his superior officer, he wishes to express appreciation.

It is requested that you continue to maintain this liaison with the writer in connection with periodic reports, reference to subject letter.

In closing I would like to quote the testimony of Mr. Wayne C. Taylor before the Appropriations Committee on this subject:

Our whole approach toward the field office set-up is in terms of the best service that a Government department can render to the business community and particularly to the small business community. Our experience has proven in every way possible that unless you can be where business is, particularly where small business is, you cannot be effective. Therefore, in reorganizing the department, particularly this field service, 2 years ago, and anticipating a great many of the things which have taken place in the years in connection with the war itself, and in connection with the impact of the war on small business, we based our plans on improving the structure which existed, namely, the field-office structure.

I cannot say too strongly that, in my opinion, the Bureau of the Budget has made a fundamental mistake in eliminating those offices, because you must have a place where a businessman can go, without coming down to Washington; the small businessman, for example, cannot afford to come here. He cannot come down here under the conditions which you know he has to face.

I hope this amendment prevails, because it is a good amendment for the small businessmen of this country, at least.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I have sat through 5 hours of this debate and several hours of general debate yesterday so that I could be here when this particular section of the Department of Commerce bill was reached. Much of the discussion this afternoon was certainly not relevant to this particular appropriation bill. Now, late in the day, and at the final sections of the bill, the Chairman moves to cut

off debate and deny us the opportunity to present a matter to the House that is of vital importance to a large number of citizens in a great many congressional districts.

I do not like to object to a unanimous-consent request for an extension of 10 or 15 minutes of time, made by Members of this House, but after this experience today, I can see no other way to protect the interests of my constituents than to object to all requests for additional time on appropriation bills in which I have a particular interest.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] just a few minutes ago asked the question as to just how much service these regional offices extended. In the few minutes available, I will try to answer his question. Recently I asked the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut to tell me just how helpful these regional offices were to them. This association advised me that in the last 6 months of 1942, the Department of Commerce, through the office of the manufacturers association, sent out each week to 465 companies a complete recapitulation of all information pertaining to export and import procedure. This information included regulations of the Customs Division of the Treasury Department; the regulations under Executive Order 8389 relative to the freezing of foreign funds; complete information on the Proclaimed List of Blocked Nationals; information relative to the Office of Export Control; the Import Control M-63 Order; the W. P. B. M-148 Order; the Controlled Materials Plan as it affects exporting; information on foreign visitors to this country; foreign tariff regulations, and foreign financial news.

Other than the survey, 100 copies of the Comprehensive Export Control Schedule, and 100 copies of each of the Current Export Control Bulletins are sent to manufacturers throughout the State as they are released.

In addition to this, the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut inform me they were able to answer approximately 460 written inquiries as well as approximately 870 telephone inquiries, and many thousands of required forms were distributed by the office. They also obtained sales information report on 25 foreign agents and political information pertaining to pro-Nazi activities on 15 agents.

We all know that when this war comes to an end, thousands of manufacturers, both large and small, are going to try to find a market for their product. Many of them will naturally turn toward South America. There is a widespread opinion that our cash exports have fallen off greatly since the war started. As a matter of fact, according to official figures issued by the Department of Commerce, our cash exports handled through private channels in this country amounted to \$3,158,000,000 in 1942. This is slightly larger than the average for the pre-war years of 1936-38. This large export business is subject to a great many regulations with which the exporter must be familiar if he is to do his business efficiently and profitably.

When in the slightest doubt, he naturally turns to the nearest field office of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, where he has been going for help for a great many years. He knows that these regional offices are fully informed and anxious to help.

Just why these offices should now be closed, in spite of the record of rendering efficient service over a period of 30 years, is beyond me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED.]

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, sometime ago when the Doughton so-called pay-as-you-go bill was up for consideration, I made a statement with reference to loan sharks. This is a good opportunity for you to find out something about this loan-shark racket, because on page 121 of the hearings on the Department of Justice appropriation bill you will find that Mr. Comer, representing the Attorney General's office, testified as follows:

What we need to do is to get over the country and bring this chart up to date and see the degree of overlapping in the ownership of local companies.

He was referring to loan companies.

This may become one of the biggest anti-trust suits we ever had, because there is \$500,000,000 lent at 30 and 36 percent annually, and roughly \$100,000,000 lent at 120 and 240 percent. Loan sharks are especially troublesome around the war plants. They cluster around those gates like flies to lend their money at these ruinous rates.

The war agencies have complained. Some have said that they have either got to stop making more airplanes or get rid of the loan sharks around the plants.

To show you how important it is to have a current pay-as-you-earn collection system, our estimated Federal tax load for 1944 is \$33,081,000,000, which, with State and local taxes of \$10,000,000,000, and \$16,000,000,000 of new taxes that we shall have to raise, means that the people will have to carry a load of taxes amounting to \$60,000,000,000, or half the national income.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, these old-line offices of the Department of Commerce have done good work in promoting the freest sort of flow of commerce in the past. They are definitely aiding in the transportation of military supplies and civilian needs as well as expediting the exchanges of raw materials.

They should be kept in shape for the vital work of reestablishing the freest kind of flow of commerce after the war ends.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, no matter what is said about the Department of Commerce, it must be admitted that it has been and it is now a very important source of information that is sought by nearly every department of our Government. Whatever is done with the legislation now under consideration, we must be careful to guard against possibility that some other agency or some other bureau does not

set up another bureau or agency which would duplicate the work already done and work being done by the Department of Commerce. The Department of Commerce is an old-established Department. It has been the target of considerable criticism. Some of it, in my opinion, unjust. Some of it may have been justified. The charges of duplication of work have considerable merit. There has been and, in my opinion, there is now duplication. That is costing the taxpayers considerable money. Let me give you a few instances of these duplications. Duplications which cannot be charged to the Department of Commerce.

After our entry into the war there arose a need for expert advice on industrial facilities and products of foreign countries. The Coordinator of Information sent representatives into the field to obtain from trade associations and others the names of Americans with specialized knowledge of foreign countries. The Board of Economic Warfare required similar information. The Department of Commerce was suggested as the logical source, and it was learned that the Department already had much of the desired information, but also had the contacts and facilities to supplement it on a Nation-wide basis. The Department, through its field offices, developed information on 6,000 persons able to supply specific data on foreign countries. This basic file is now available to and is being utilized by a number of war agencies.

In connection with the operation of the proclaimed list of certain blocked nationals—black list—numerous cases have arisen where the Department of Commerce, through its field offices, has assisted manufacturers and exporters to replace undesirable foreign connections. These companies were later approached by compliance officers of other agencies only to find that the matter had already been satisfactorily adjusted through the efforts of the Commerce representatives. One case involved a manufacturer of hand lanterns in connection with its representation in Ecuador. Another involved an American exporter of wearing apparel, whose representative in Peru had already been dispensed with, and a new distributor found for him by the Department of Commerce. An additional example is a Wisconsin firm who had been approached by the compliance officer to explain his relationship with a Mexican firm, details of which were already in the possession of the Department of Commerce. A special representative of another agency went to a mid-western city to ascertain the attitude of a manufacturer toward compliance with existing regulations. Interviews previously conducted by the Department of Commerce and reported to Washington contained all of the information needed to determine the attitude of the firm.

The field offices of the Department of Commerce have carried on a number of surveys for the Board of Economic Warfare on economic conditions and industries in European and Far Eastern countries. Similar assignments have been given to the field representatives of the Department of Justice and the Securities and Exchange Commission. In a num-

ber of cases such representatives have found it necessary to call upon the field offices of the Department of Commerce to obtain the names of persons able to contribute information. Familiarity with the subject matter and the training of the Commerce field men have equipped them to carry out assignments of this character with precision and dispatch. Their facilities for this type of work are unequalled in any other agency.

The Department of Justice and the Treasury Department instituted a systematic interviewing of New York exporters to obtain information on the character of goods exported by specific American firms, how long established, names of officers, principal markets, and the names of foreign agents and distributors. Thousands of firms had already registered with the Department of Commerce furnishing information on the first four points, and on the fifth the Department had a few months before completed a survey to obtain this information in connection with the replacement of undesirable connections. The interviews very largely duplicated information already in possession of the Department of Commerce.

The Office of Price Administration has a special section of the Division of Research dealing in foreign experience in price control. Price-control policies in foreign countries have engaged the attention of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce for a number of years and several reports have been published on the subject. Some of the studies of the O. P. A. have been based on data originally collected by the Bureau. For example, the Bureau published a 12-page report on Price Control in Germany—Policy and Technique, in April 1941, and in October 1942 the O. P. A. published a Chronology of Price Control in Germany, based very largely on material furnished by Commerce.

Within the past 2 months two representatives of war agencies in Washington were sent to South America to make a study of the hide situation and to develop information on the supply available, where stored, and why shipments were not forthcoming to the United States. Much of the required information was readily obtainable through the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce. What up-to-the-minute details were needed could have been obtained from the American Foreign Service through the Bureau, whose regular function is to supply such data to Government and business.

The Department has 30 field offices. My information is that they started back in 1913. In spite of what is said about the lack of business in these offices, I find that there have been 534,243 inquiries in these offices during 1942, as compared to 509,103 in 1941. That shows businessmen used these offices more throughout last year. In 1941, 106,000 businessmen made personal calls on these offices. These calls jumped to 114,000 in 1942. Since last January 1, the Department has received 69 directives from the Board of Economic Warfare alone.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the

House to the various departments in the Government chiefly that use these field offices. If you eliminate them, you are simply going to re-create offices of this type in these other departments. There is the Board of Economic Warfare, which uses them; the Office of Price Administration uses these offices; War Production Board; Postal Censorship; Cable Censorship; Radio Censorship; and the distinguished gentleman has spoken of the military and naval agencies. All of these departments are vital in the conduct of the war. They all use these offices constantly. Various divisions of the Treasury Department use them; for instance, Foreign Funds Control, Internal Revenue, War Shipping Administration, Securities and Exchange Commission. Practically all field agencies of Washington use these field offices of the Department of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and I earnestly hope that the advantage to small business will not be destroyed and that the item will be restored. It is like cutting off the right arm of small business. I refer you to the able plea of the gentleman from Ohio for continuing existing department offices and not duplicating or creating new offices in other Government agencies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] made special reference to the duplication of these services. I think there is little economy in the destruction of these old line established offices, which the Bureau of the Budget admits have contributed much to the war effort, but which it intends to destroy and supplant with other agencies. The same amount of money will be expended through other sources. One of the original purposes of the establishment of the Board of Economic Warfare was to bypass the State Department and the Department of Commerce in its foreign relations division. I see where we gain little economy in having the puppet show put on by the Bureau of the Budget in their attempt to destroy these offices.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I am against this amendment because there has been no showing on the record that the Department of Commerce field offices are worth the amount of money it is necessary to keep them going for another year.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just came into the Chamber. A Democrat over here said that the Republicans were increasing the number of bureaucrats. I want to find out about that before I vote.

Mr. JONES. It certainly is not true of any member of the subcommittee that reported the bill. We heard the request of the Department of Commerce and we were open-minded. We were absolutely unprejudiced in coming to a conclusion,

and we are doing now the very best that can be hoped for. What could be fairer than to send out our investigators to see if there is any necessity for continuing these field offices? We went further. We called before our committee Mr. Milo Perkins. It was charged by the Department of Commerce that they were doing work for the B. E. W. and for the State Department. Milo Perkins, Administrator of B. E. W., said that they had given to the field offices \$50,000 for everything the field offices had done for B. E. W. We asked Mr. Perkins whether he would be willing to go further than the \$50,000 next year, if we cut out the field offices and he said that he intended to give them no more money. He told us that he would go no further than \$50,000. The amendment should not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this is a question of the downright sincerity of the House. Nobody is more favorable to the Department than the members of our committee. We have been very lenient with the Department in the past. We are very favorable to the Department now and want to be fair with the Department at all times. But if the Members will look on page 61 and page 263 of the hearings they will obtain all the information needed on this subject.

The following questions were asked of representatives of the Board of Economic Warfare:

If these offices are discontinued would you establish offices in their place?

The answer was—

No, sir; we would not do that.

On the next page Mr. Carter asked the question:

You could get the information otherwise; could you not?

And he said—

I would say that we could.

Now, the committee wishing to go even further, has placed in the report the following language, and to be fair will be guided by the findings of the investigators:

The reduction in the appropriation for 1943 of \$444,000, as reflected in the Budget estimates, is accounted for by a decrease of \$14,000 recommended for the Washington office, and the elimination of the Bureau's domestic field offices, which carried an appropriation of \$430,000 in fiscal year 1943. With respect to the latter item, the committee has allowed the Bureau of the Budget recommendation to stand temporarily without prejudice to the status of the offices as to permanent continuance or discontinuance. The committee has, under authority of House Resolution 69, instituted an inquiry of its own with the view of securing complete factual data for a subsequent determination as to their disposition. If the report on this examination is not available to the committee while the bill is in the amendment stage, and if favorable action is later recommended, it can be incorporated in a supplemental or deficiency bill in order that any funds which may be determined for this purpose may become available by July 1, 1943.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I would like to say that I am glad to see the gentleman fighting for economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Connecticut) there were—ayes 72, noes 135.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2397) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Carter amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the so-called Andresen amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARTER: On page 29, line 13, strike out "\$4,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RABAUT) there were ayes 120 and noes 110.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 163, nays 169, not voting 102, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

YEAS—163

Andersen,	Goodwin	Mruk
H. Carl	Grant, Ind.	Murray, Wis.
Andersen.	Griffiths	Norman
August H.	Gwynne	O'Hara
Angell	Hale	O'Konski
Arends	Hall	Phillips
Arnold	Edwin Arthur	Pittenger
Auchincloss	Hall	Ploeser
Baldwin, N. Y.	Leonard W.	Poulson
Barrett	Halleck	Powers
Beall	Hancock	Pracht
Bender	Harness, Ind.	Ramey
Bennett, Mich.	Hartley	Reece, Tenn.
Bishop	Heldinger	Reed, Ill.
Blackney	Herter	Reed, N. Y.
Bolton	Hess	Rees, Kans.
Bradley, Mich.	Hill	Rizley
Brehm	Hoeven	Rockwell
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Rodgers, Pa.
Buffett	Holmes, Wash.	Rohrbough
Burdick	Hope	Rolph
Busbey	Horan	Rowe
Butler	Hull	Sauthoff
Canfield	Jeffrey	Schiffner
Carlson, Kans.	Jenkins	Schwabe
Carson, Ohio	Jennings	Shafer
Carter	Jensen	Short
Case	Johnson,	Simpson, Ill.
Chenoweth	Anton J.	Simpson, Pa.
Chilperfield	Johnson,	Smith, Ohio
Church	Calvin D.	Smith, Wis.
Ciason	Johnson, Ind.	Springer
Clevenger	Johnson, Ward	Stanley
Cole, Mo.	Jones	Stefan
Crawford	Jonkman	Stockman
Cunningham	Keefe	Sumner, Ill.
Curtis	Kilburn	Sundstrom
Day	Kinzer	Taber
Dirksen	Kunkel	Talbot
Ditter	Landis	Talle
Dondero	LeCompte	Taylor
Dworshak	LeFevre	Thomas, N. J.
Ellis	Lemke	Tibbott
Ellsworth	Lewis, Ohio	Towe
Elmer	McCowan	Troutman
Elston, Ohio	McGregor	Van Zandt
Englebright	McLean	Vorys, Ohio
Fellows	McWilliams	Vursell
Fenton	Martin, Iowa	Weichel, Ohio
Fish	Martin, Mass.	Welchel, Ga.
Gamble	Marrow	Wigglesworth
Gavin	Michener	Willey
Gerlach	Miller, Mo.	Wolcott
Gifford	Miller, Nebr.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gilchrist	Miller, Pa.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gillette	Monkiewicz	
Gillie	Morrison La.	

NAYS—169

Abernethy	Eberharter	Johnson,
Anderson,	Ellison, Md.	Luther A.
N. Mex.	Fay	Johnson,
Andrews	Feighan	Lyndon B.
Baldwin, Md.	Fernandez	Johnson, Okla.
Beckworth	Fisher	Judd
Bland	Fitzpatrick	Kean
Bloom	Flannagan	Kefauver
Bradley, Pa.	Folger	Kelley
Brown, Ga.	Forand	Kennedy
Bryson	Ford	Keogh
Buckley	Fulbright	Kerr
Bulwinkle	Fulmer	Kilday
Burchill, N. Y.	Furlong	King
Burgin	Gale	Kirwan
Camp	Gathings	Klein
Cannon, Mo.	Gore	Lane
Chapman	Gossett	Lanham
Cochran	Granger	Lesinski
Coffee	Grant, Ala.	Ludlow
Compton	Green	Lynch
Cooley	Gregory	McCord
Cooper	Hagen	McCormack
Costello	Hare	McGranery
Courtney	Harless, Ariz.	McMillan
Cravens	Harris, Ark.	McMurray
Creal	Harris, Va.	Madden
Crosser	Hart	Magnuson
Curley	Hays	Mahon
D'Alesandro	Heffernan	Maloney
Davis	Hendricks	Manasco
Delaney	Hinschaw	Mansfield,
Dickstein	Hobbs	Mont.
Dies	Hoch	Marcantonio
Dilweg	Hollfield	May
Drewry	Jackson	Merritt
Durham	Jarman	Miller, Conn.

Mills
Monroney
Mundt
Murdoch
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.
Myers
Newsome
Norrell
Norton
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Connor
O'Leary
O'Neal
Pace
Patman
Patton
Peterson, Fla.
Philbin
Poage
Price

Priest
Rabaut
Ramspeck
Rankin
Rivers
Robertson
Rogers, Mass.
Russell
Sadowski
Sasser
Satterfield
Scanlon
Schuetz
Sheridan
Slaughter
Smith, W. Va.
Snyder
Somers, N. Y.
Sparkman
Spence
Steagall

Stearns, N. H.
Stewart
Sullivan
Tarver
Thomas, Tex.
Vince, Ky.
Voorhis, Calif.
Walter
Ward
Wasielewski
Weiss
Wene
White
Whitten
Whittington
Wickersham
Winstead
Worley
Wright
Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—102

Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Anderson, Calif.
Barden
Barry
Bates, Ky.
Bates, Mass.
Bell
Bennett, Mo.
Bonner
Boren
Boykin
Brooks
Burch, Va.
Byrne
Cannon, Fla.
Capozzoli
Celler
Clark
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Cox
Culkin
Cullen
Dawson
Dewey
Dingell
Disney
Domengeaux
Doughton
Douglas
Eaton
Elliott
Engel
Fogarty

Gallagher
Gavagan
Gearhart
Gibson
Gordon
Gorski
Graham
Gross
Guyer
Hébert
Holmes, Mass.
Howell
Izac
Johnson, J. Leroy
Kearney
Kee
Kleberg
Knutson
LaFollette
Lambertson
Larcade
Lea
Lewis, Colo.
Luce
McGehee
McKenzie
Maas
Mansfield, Tex.
Mason
Morrison, N. C.
Mott
Nichols
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.

O'Toole
Outland
Peterson, Ga.
Pfeiffer
Plumley
Randolph
Richards
Robinson, Utah
Robison, Ky.
Rogers, Calif.
Rowan
Sabath
Scott
Sheppard
Sikes
Smith, Maine
Smith, Va.
Starnes, Ala.
Stevenson
Summers, Tex.
Thomason
Tolan
Treadway
Vinson, Ga.
Wadsworth
Weaver
Welch
West
Wheat
Wilson
Winter
Wolverton, N. J.
Woodrum, Va.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Treadway for, with Mr. Doughton against.
Mrs. Smith of Maine for, with Mr. Gordon against.
Mr. Robison of Kentucky for, with Mr. Gorski against.
Mr. Monkiewicz for, with Mr. Sheppard against.
Mr. O'Brien of New York for, with Mr. Colmer against.
Mr. Stevenson for, with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois against.
Mr. LaFollette for, with Mr. Outland against.
Mr. Domengeaux for, with Mr. Boren against.
Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. Pfeiffer against.
Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. Dingell against.
Mr. Douglas for, with Mr. Weaver against.
Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Barnes against.
Mr. Graham for, with Mr. Starnes of Alabama against.
Mr. Guyer for, with Mr. O'Toole against.
Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Cullen against.
Mr. Howell for, with Mr. Lewis of Colorado against.
Mr. Knutson for, with Mr. Randolph against.
Mr. Wheat for, with Mr. Gavagan against.
Mr. Wilson for, with Mr. Rowan against.
Mr. Bennett of Missouri for, with Mr. Elliott against.

General pairs:

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Dewey.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Engel.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. West with Mr. Scott.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDERSEN: Page 68, line 13, after the word "appropriated", insert "Provided further, That no part of the appropriation in this paragraph shall be used for inquiries or investigations relating to dairy products or for promotional activities, inquiries, or investigations in connection with oleomargarine, filled milk, filled cheese, and other pretended substitutes for dairy products."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 158, noes 137.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 177, nays 147, not voting 110, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]
YEAS—177

Andersen, August H.
Angell
Arends
Arnold
Auchincloss
Baldwin, N. Y.
Barrett
Beall
Bender
Bennett, Mich.
Bishop
Blackney
Bolton
Bradley, Mich.
Brehm
Brown, Ohio
Buffett
Burdick
Busbey
Butler
Canfield
Cannon, Mo.
Carlson, Kans.
Carson, Ohio
Carter
Case
Chenoweth
Chipfield
Church
Clason
Clevenger
Cole, Mo.
Compton
Crawford
Cunningham
Curtis
Dillweg
Dirksen
Ditter
Dondoro
Dworshak
Ellis
Ellsworth
Elmer
Elston, Ohio
Englebright
Fellows

Fenton
Fish
Gale
Gamble
Gavin
Gerlach
Gifford
Gilchrist
Gillette
Gillie
Goodwin
Granger
Grant, Ind.
Griffiths
Gwynne
Hagen
Hale
Hall
Edwin Arthur
Halleck
Hancock
Harness, Ind.
Hartley
Heidinger
Herter
Hess
Hill
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman
Holmes, Wash.
Hope
Horan
Hull
Jeffrey
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johnson, Anton J.
Johnson, Calvin D.
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson, Ward
Jones
Jonkman
Judd
Kean
Keefe
Kilburn

Kinzer
Kunkel
Landis
LeCompte
LeFevre
Lemke
Lewis, Ohio
McCowan
McGregor
McLean
McWilliams
Mansfield, Mont.
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Marrow
Michener
Miller, Conn.
Miller, Mo.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, Pa.
Monkiewicz
Morrison, La.
Mrak
Mundt
Murray, Wis.
Norman
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Connor
O'Hara
O'Konski
Phillips
Pittenger
Ploesser
Poulson
Powers
Pracht
Ramey
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Rizley
Rockwell
Rodgers, Pa.
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Rolph
Rowe
Sauthoff

Schiffler
Schwabe
Shafer
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stanley
Stearns, N. H.

Stefan
Stockman
Sundstrom
Taber
Talbot
Talle
Taylor
Thomas, N. J.
Tibbott
Towe
Troutman

NAYS—147

Abernethy
Allen, La.
Anderson, N. Mex.
Beckworth
Bland
Bloom
Bradley, Pa.
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Bryson
Buckley
Bulwinkle
Burchill, N. Y.
Burgin
Camp
Capozzoli
Chapman
Cochran
Cooley
Cooper
Costello
Courtney
Cravens
Creal
Crosser
Curley
D'Alesandro
Davis
Delaney
Dickstein
Dies
Drewry
Durham
Elliott, Md.
Fay
Felghan
Fernandez
Fisher
Fitzpatrick
Flannagan
Folger
Forand
Ford
Fulbright
Fulmer
Furlong
Gathings
Gossett
Grant, Ala.

Green
Gregory
Hare
Harless, Ariz.
Harris, Ark.
Harris, Va.
Hart
Heffernan
Hendricks
Hobbs
Hoch
Hollfield
Jarman
Johnson, Luther A.
Johnson, Lyndon B.
Johnson, Okla.
Kefauver
Kelley
Kennedy
Keogh
Kilday
King
Kirwan
Klein
Lane
Lanham
Lea
Lesinski
Ludlow
Lynch
McCormack
McGranery
McMillan
McMurray
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Maloney
Manasco
Marcantonio
May
Merritt
Mills
Monroney
Murphy
Murray, Tenn.
Newsome

Norrell
Norton
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Leary
O'Neal
Pace
Patman
Patton
Peterson, Fla.
Philbin
Poage
Price
Priest
Rabaut
Ramspeck
Rankin
Rivers
Robertson
Russell
Sadowski
Sasser
Satterfield
Scanlon
Schuetz
Sheridan
Slaughter
Smith, W. Va.
Snyder
Somers, N. Y.
Sparkman
Spence
Steagall
Stewart
Sullivan
Tarver
Thomas, Tex.
Vince, Ky.
Voorhis, Calif.
Walter
Ward
Weiss
Wene
Whelchel, Ga.
Whitten
Whittington
Wickersham
Winstead
Worley
Wright
Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—110

Allen, Ill.
Anderson, Calif.
Andrews
Baldwin, Md.
Barden
Barry
Bates, Ky.
Bates, Mass.
Bell
Bennett, Mo.
Bonner
Boren
Boykin
Burch, Va.
Byrne
Cannon, Fla.
Celler
Clark
Coffee
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Cox
Culkin
Cullen
Dawson
Day
Dewey
Dingell
Disney
Domengeaux
Doughton
Douglas
Eaton
Eberharter
Elliott
Engel
Fogarty
Gallagher

Gavagan
Gearhart
Gibson
Gordon
Gore
Gorski
Graham
Gross
Guyer
Hall, Leonard W.
Hays
Hébert
Holmes, Mass.
Howell
Izac
Jackson
Johnson, J. Leroy
Kearney
Kee
Kerr
Kleberg
Knutson
LaFollette
Lambertson
Larcade
Lewis, Colo.
Luce
McCord
McGehee
McKenzie
Mansfield, Tex.
Mason
Morrison, N. C.
Mott
Murdoch

Nichols
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Toole
Outland
Peterson, Ga.
Pfeiffer
Plumley
Randolph
Richards
Robinson, Utah
Robison, Ky.
Rogers, Calif.
Rowan
Sabath
Scott
Sheppard
Sikes
Smith, Maine
Smith, Va.
Starnes, Ala.
Stevenson
Sumner, Ill.
Summers, Tex.
Thomason
Tolan
Treadway
Vinson, Ga.
Wadsworth
Weaver
Welch
West
Wheat
Wilson
Winter
Wolverton, N. J.
Woodrum, Va.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Treadway for, with Mr. Doughton against.

Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts for, with Mr. O'Toole against.

Mr. Boren for, with Mr. Domengeaux against.

Mr. Jackson for, with Mr. Dingell against.

General pairs:

Mr. Gordon with Mr. Smith of Maine.

Mr. Gorski with Mr. Robison of Kentucky.

Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Outland with Mr. LaFollette.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Burch of Virginia with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Weaver with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Byrne with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Graham.

Mr. Cullen with Mr. Guyer.

Mr. Lewis of Colorado with Mr. Howell.

Mr. Randolph with Mr. Knutson.

Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Wheat.

Mr. Rowan with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Elliott with Mr. Bennett of Missouri.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Gallagher.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Lambertson.

Mr. Cox with Mr. Engel.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. West with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Maas.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Welch.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS ON THE STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOURLY OF MEETING AND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the majority leader tell us what the program is for tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; the legislative appropriations bill and the Hobbs bill.

I understand that general debate on the legislative appropriations bill will

be 2 hours. After the legislative bill is disposed of we will take up the Hobbs bill.

I may say in further amplification of the program that between now and a week from Saturday we have a great deal of business to take care of, but I hope we shall be able to dispose of it. I hope we can at least finish general debate on the Hobbs bill tomorrow. That would be very helpful.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it intended to vote on the Hobbs bill tomorrow if we get through with debate on it, or will the vote go over until Friday or Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; we are going to sit Friday and Saturday, and it is very important that Members be here. As a matter of fact, a bill from the Committee on Immigration is on the calendar for the latter part of the week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Which bill, may I ask?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. A bill to restore citizenship to deserting soldiers who have been taken back into the Army. Under present law, upon court martial such soldiers lose their citizenship. The bill was reported out unanimously and it has the approval of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Marine Corps.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file a supplemental report on the bill; H. R. 653, to amend the Antiracketeering Act.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the Record.)

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. McMURRAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GERLACH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record by printing two short editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

PASSAGE OF TAX BILL

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, American taxpayers are beginning to burn with indignation over the threatened delay now being voiced by administration leaders—or some of them—in devising a tax bill which will embrace current payment features.

There is no question in anybody's mind, at least those who have studied the situation, that we will have to devise a current-payment tax plan so the American people can pay as they earn. Unless this is done, the Government will find itself confronted with an impossible tax-collection situation, and the individual citizens will find themselves confronted with an impossible tax-payment situation. There was no excuse, no valid reason whatsoever, for the administration to make the Carlson tax plan a political football as they did.

Figures have been presented from time to time showing that the amount of income in 1942, based on a 1940 dollar, was about \$18,000,000,000 for those above the income level of \$10,000 per year; that the income for the group between \$1,700 and \$10,000 a year amounted to about \$73,000,000,000; and that the income of the group below \$1,700 a year was about \$9,000,000,000. Any effort to trace down figures like these through governmental departments usually results in complete frustration, for in spite of all the thousands upon thousands of statisticians, census takers, enumerators, evaluators, research economists, and so forth, and in spite of all the billions of dollars being spent in reams of research and other reams of propaganda, whenever a Member of Congress or an ordinary citizen wants to get a definite figure on income, he is shifted from one department to another, and from one bureau to another bureau, until finally, worn out with fruitless telephone calls, he gives up in disgust. An attempt to check the figures given here through the Treasury, through the Department of Commerce, and then through O. P. A., resulted in exactly nothing except that nobody knew, or was willing to attempt to say, what the national income is by brackets, where the

inflationary dangers lie, or who could say positively that any figure is correct.

Apparently the figures quoted in these comments are about as nearly correct as it is possible for general figures to be. It does seem quite clear that instead of a pay-as-you-go plan being a rich man's device, its beneficial effects would fall most markedly upon that class of people earning from \$1,700 up to \$10,000 a year, with by far the greatest class being within the income bracket between \$1,700 and \$5,000 a year.

All talk about the deferment of 1942 income taxes being a rich man's device is based upon a few isolated cases in which windfalls might be temporarily received by a very few individuals until the windfall amendment incorporated in the Carlson bill, the gift, income, and estate taxes, caught up with them. If millions of taxpayers with an income of \$73,000,000,000 must be penalized in our tax laws because a pay-as-you-earn plan might give such a temporary windfall to 20 or 30 individuals in the United States, then we have indeed reached a sad condition of government and our traditional American system is well on the way to extinction.

It is preposterous and outrageous to legislate a tax bill for millions of people with \$73,000,000,000 of income on a basis of punitive motives against a small number of citizens.

The American people are now fully aware of the dangers which lie in the immediate future for them. Next year's taxes are going to be higher than this year's taxes. This year's are, of course, to be higher than 1942 taxes. We are thus going on compounding our problem, while, at the same time, the tax bill and the tax plan are made the political football of politicians who consider it more important, apparently, to keep class prejudice aroused and flaming than they do to secure a sound tax measure which will guarantee the Government the greatest revenue return, while, at the same time, putting the American people on a basis which every informed person knows must be adopted for future taxation.

There is a tendency on the part of some to dismiss the present attitude of the majority and of the Ways and Means Committee chairman with the comforting thought that if a new tax plan is not evolved and adopted taxes will go right on pouring in under the old system. The fact is, times have changed. Our situation is unparalleled in our history. The inconceivable national debt before we went into this war, and the inconceivable debt which is now being piled on top of the pre-war debt, make it imperative that we adopt a new pay-as-you-earn tax basis if we want to avoid economic chaos in this country after the war. Those willing to defeat a current-payment tax plan because of their utter hostility to a few individuals of large incomes are, whether they realize it or not, simply taking the position that they are willing to risk economic chaos and ruin for America rather than risk a decidedly temporary windfall for a few individuals whose incomes can be fully dealt with

under present laws, together with the proposed windfall tax provision.

We simply must keep at it, and the people of this country simply must continue to demand of their Representatives in Congress that a current-payment tax plan be worked out, and that we get on the kind of a tax basis the new conditions created by our stupendous national debt and the war make inescapable for us if we are to survive and keep our American economy from toppling into the abyss of planned economic chaos.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Colorado [Mr. HILL] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Fitchburg Sentinel, of Fitchburg, Mass., and also a recent article from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have obtained permission to extend my remarks in several instances, but due to the pressure of work I have not been able to use them. The time is about to expire, and I therefore renew the requests.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made today and that they may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes today after the other special orders for the day have been disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman will withdraw his request because I do not think we ought to run any later.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. You already have one special order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This is on an important matter.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not think we ought to run any later.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

DEVELOPMENT OF LIGNITE COAL RESOURCES

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, on three former occasions I have attempted to draw the attention of the Congress and the country to the strategic value of lignite coal in our war effort. I made the first speech on August 17, 1942, and the second on August 20, 1942. In those speeches I showed that in North Dakota alone, not including Wyoming, Montana, South Dakota, and Texas, we have 600,000,000,000 tons of lignite coal and that Germany, in brown coal—lignite—including all the countries she has overrun, has about 60,000,000,000 tons or one-tenth of what North Dakota alone has.

Germany is getting 75 percent of its electric power for war industries, fully 80 percent of its sulfuric acid, coal-tar distillates, and sundry chemicals for the manufacture of explosives, and upward of 80 percent of its synthetic gasoline and its Diesel oil, as well as materials for synthetic rubber for mechanized war machinery—all from the brown coal which it controls.

In all these essential properties the German brown coal is inferior to our lignite coal. Lignite coal in North Dakota per hundred tons of mined coal will average 32 tons of oil. Dry coal will average 49 tons of oil per 100 tons of coal. The Velva mine in North Dakota runs much higher, samples of dry coal running 60 to 65 percent oil. In tar acids used in the manufacture of explosives, the German brown coal is vastly inferior to our lignite.

The only advantage Germany has over us is that Germany is using her coal and we refuse to have anything to do with ours.

In January 1943 I again called the attention of Congress to this subject. In this speech I not only showed the extent of Germany's coal and our coal, but gave the record of what our enemies are doing with their brown coal. Germany is increasing her processing of coal by

leaps and bounds because without the oil and materials for explosives derived from this coal, Germany would soon find herself driven back beyond her own borders and would finally be crushed.

If you will look at the war map of Europe, you will note one most peculiar situation of that map. Just to the west of the Donets Basin you will find a city called Orel, pronounced precisely as our Oriole bird name is pronounced. It is spelled O-r-e-l. On this war map of Europe you will note that the tide of advance and retreat has affected the whole Russian battle front except this one place, Orel. There is a line which has remained permanent since its first occupation by the German armies.

The Donets Basin contains the great brown coal deposits of Russia, and from this coal the Germans expect to get their oil, explosives, and rubber. Orel is the great manufacturing and railroad center servicing the basin. If the Russians succeed in driving the Germans out of the Donets Basin and in capturing Orel, you may expect the collapse of the German offensive in Russia. One time this winter the Russians came near to accomplishing this important feat, but you will observe that the Germans put no extra pressure on the Russian line anywhere except in the Donets Basin. There they have again driven the Russians out and as long as they hold this area, we may expect the Germans to remain an advancing force.

With our own shortage of oil and rubber and ingredients for war purposes you would think this Government would make some move to use what we have in abundance.

Some 21 years ago some enterprising men made tests of coal from every corner of the globe and from these tests it was determined that the lignite field of North Dakota offered the greatest opportunity to process coal and obtain the most valuable derivatives for war and commercial purposes. No one asked them to build their plant at Minot, N. Dak., a point accessible to the best coal beds as a railroad center. These people came to Minot solely because of their scientific investigations and in 1941 began the erection of a plant for the purpose of processing lignite coal, especially having in view the production of chemicals and gas. In this enterprise these men and their friends invested over \$400,000, but before they could complete their plant priorities went into effect, and it was not until October 16, 1942, that this company was able to secure permission to buy the materials needed in completing their plant. During all these months business was at a standstill.

In the meantime Congress had set up an organization known as the Smaller War Plants Corporation with a loan fund of \$150,000,000 to make loans to smaller plants engaged in or about to be engaged in the production of war materials. Loan application was made to this concern for a loan of \$300,000 to be used for the following purposes:

- First. To complete facilities.
- Second. Operating capital.

The next question that arose was this: Was such a plant about to manufacture essential war materials? The matter was fully presented to the Navy Department and they certified that cresylic acid was an essential war material and in their judgment this concern, operating, could supply the material. The concern filed their application for a loan, agreeing among other things to permit Government engineers to supervise the production, and agreed to permit a disbursing agent of the Government to handle the loan money to make sure that the loan would be disposed of as outlined in the application.

This loan was rejected and it took 12 weeks to find out why. In desperation these people came to me in the hope that I could do something to hurry up this loan so they could go to work. After this lapse of time the reasons were assigned, the principal one being that unless the Navy Department would guarantee half of the loan, it would not be made. These people asked me if they should go back to the Navy Department and ask this guaranty and I told them flatly, "No." I told them the Navy was fighting battles and was not in the loaning business. This nettled the operators and managers of the Smaller War Plants Corporation and these people, the Western Carbon & Chemical, Inc., were plainly made to understand that it was bad taste for them to go to the Hill for assistance. You can see that when we create one of these agencies and start it out on its express business, they forget all about who created them and forget the purposes for which they were created and damn their creator.

The reasons they give for turning down this loan are pathetic. Here they are:

First. Over 80 percent of the loan was to be used for plant facilities.

Second. The need for cresylic acid was not so great as had been anticipated by the Bureau of Ships.

Third. The Navy Department saw no reason why they should guarantee the Smaller War Plants Corporation in any loan without reference to the authority given them under Public Law 603.

Fourth. Investigation disclosed that oil leaseholds above referred to in net worth figure of K. C. Moody were subject to judgment notes in the State of Pennsylvania to the extent of \$98,000 and therefore the value of the proposed endorsement was questionable.

Fifth. The Navy Department would not guarantee that there was no past experience with actual production of cresylic acid; nor any actual indication other than a survey by the Navy as to the quantity of lignite coal to be used in making cresylic acid nor any appraisal available on the leaseholds or fixed assets. It was assumed at that time that if such a shortage of cresylic acid existed that it could be made available by the installation of plants in other lignite coal areas which would not entail the expense anticipated and apparent in this case.

Sixth. The company is heavily encumbered by judgments and although the principals have made a large investment

in order to install the proposed plant in this area, their outside financial responsibility is questionable.

What difference does it make whether the president of this concern is worth \$750,000 or 75 cents? One-half million, nearly, has been put into this plant and these people offer to turn the management of it over to the Government while they produce a material which the Navy say they must have.

They say this material can be produced more cheaply elsewhere when it is a fact beyond all dispute that no place on this globe outside of the strip-mined lignite coal in the West can it be produced for \$1.15 per ton. Add to this that these people have the process formula, and no one else, and you can see that this reason is no reason at all, but merely an excuse.

They still insist that the Navy shall go into the loan business. One other reason bears examination. They say this plant did not start out as a plant to produce chemicals but was a briquetting plant. They know this is absolutely false. This concern never at any time was connected with briquetting. They bought out the property of an abandoned briquetting plant and used what material they could salvage in erecting their present plant. If this is not an excuse instead of a reason, I never saw an excuse.

I do not know anything about the background of the men in control of this Corporation, but they look to me like a bunch of bankers who want to obtain a positively secure loan, instead of contributing to the war effort. They appear to be more concerned with having bankable paper than they are in stopping Hitler, who if not stopped would render valueless all paper—bankable and otherwise.

Why all these excuses and not one single reason? Are there any interests in the country opposed to the processing of lignite? Are there any interests in America opposed to the production of rubber and gasoline from coal? Are there any foreign interests opposed to our production of rubber after the war? Are the men who operate this corporation subject to the influence of any interest outside of the defense of their own country?

The only possible reason I am able to assign for this flat refusal to aid this concern—as was intended by Congress—is that if this one plant is set up in the lignite fields of this country, and the value of this coal is once demonstrated in the production of oil, rubber, and the countless number of derivatives, it will revolutionize business in oil, rubber, and explosives.

If this demonstration is once set up the idea of shipping rubber from the Orient will be a lost business so far as consumption of rubber in the United States is concerned. Wildcat oil wells will be a thing of the past because every plant set up will be a sure-shot oil producer, running in coal as mined 30 to 50 percent and in dry coal 60 to 65 percent. Just think of it, 650 tons of oil out of every 1,000 tons processed.

From the lignite fields of North Dakota we can increase our gasoline consumption 50 percent in the Army, Navy, and in the air, and also supply every civilian need with 50 percent more fuel than that required today, and continue the war for 78 years. This lignite field offers such gigantic opportunities that I am convinced the large business interests of this country are afraid to actually see a demonstration.

Here the Government has an opportunity to start this business by matching \$300,000 with the \$400,000 already contributed by private capital and use the entire output, under Government management, for our war efforts. But this board does not think the loan is bankable.

They insist upon the officers of this concern guaranteeing the loan to be used for our war effort, and when the officers show a willingness to do as requested they stop short in the process of the loan to find that the property statements of the officers are too optimistic, and finally ask of the fighting forces of this country, the Navy Department, to quit shooting and go into the loan business.

There is a screw loose somewhere in the direction of the war effort. There should be unanimity of action among administrators at least.

Donald Nelson is responsible for the appointment of the directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. This bunch of directors refuse to make a loan to a concern which can make essential war materials. The Bureau of Ships in the Navy Department approved the project, yet this board set up by Donald Nelson says that the Bureau of Ships is wrong.

Donald Nelson, in his testimony before the Senate Small Business Committee on April 1, said:

That facilities necessary to produce materials needed in the war effort should not be measured by dollar values.

Yet his board controlling the Smaller War Plants Corporation say they cannot make this loan because the president of the Western Carbon and Chemical Co. is not worth as much as he says he is; they cannot make the loan unless the Navy guarantees the loan. How can the Navy? What money has the Navy got? Such money as Congress assigned to it. The people's money. Whose money does the Smaller War Plants Corporation control? The people's money—the \$150,000,000 voted by Congress. In either case it is all the people's money, so what?

Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, testified before the Senate Small Business Committee on April 1 and said:

In the early stages of our preparedness, the Government was willing to assume financial risks in order to insure an increased output of raw materials and fighting weapons. We will continue to assume such risks, if we are to succeed in our task as quickly as possible. But we must take a chance on the little fellow also. In fact, we will be committing a folly if we fail to resort to and accept each and every contribution that will lead to an aggregation of the materials we need. We are furthermore under a moral obligation to sustain small enterprise if we

wish to rebuild and retain the America that we have known, with its concepts of individual freedom and opportunity.

The majority directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation also take issue with the Navy and say, "The need for cresylic acid was not so great as has been anticipated by the Bureau of Ships."

The majority directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation disagree with Donald Nelson and they disagree with Secretary Ickes.

Then this majority board of directors go off on an entirely new tangent and say "It was assumed at that time that if such a shortage of cresylic acid existed that it could be made available in other lignite areas which would not entail the expense anticipated and apparent in this case." Did you ever hear of such rot? Other lignite fields when this concern is located in the heart of a deposit of lignite of 600,000,000 tons. Did you ever hear of such rot, when this board speaks of "cheaper cost"? Here is the case. The private individuals have their plant 80 percent completed. Did you ever hear of such rot when these directors know that this concern has the formula for this production?

This board takes the officers to task in the loan rejection because they did not go back to the Navy Department and secure a guaranty. The board says: "He said he would contact the Navy. It appears that he never carried out his expressed intention, but diverted his efforts to other channels."

I voted to establish this concern, but I serve notice now that I have voted "yes" for the last time in setting up any more agencies to assist in the war effort. The idea was good but when operators of these agencies are picked out, we seem to invariably get a bunch of men who seem to set up their own narrow standards of business rather than to carry out the will of the people as expressed by Congress. They become totally unaware that a terrific war is in progress and must have this loan bankable.

The Corporation is empowered—

To make loans or advances, on such terms and conditions and with such maturities as it may determine, to enable small business concerns to finance plant construction, conversion, or expansion, or to finance the acquisition of equipment, facilities, machinery, supplies, or materials, or to supply such concerns with capital, to be used in the manufacture of articles, equipment, supplies, or materials for war or essential civilian purposes; and such loans or advances may be made or effected either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate or by the purchase of participations, or otherwise.

The refusal of the majority directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation to make this loan, does not only concern North Dakota but it affects the destiny of 130,000,000 people. Here is a concern that knows how to do it; here is a concern 80 percent completed; here is a concern that can turn out in 3 months essential war material; here is a concern that is willing to let the Government engineer its business scientifically and financially;

but this Board says "no" in a set of reasons that are childish and positively inane. Here is a Board that does not have the slightest conception of what this war is, and bury their heads in the sand looking for gilt-edge security when the Hitler submarines are running rampant through every ocean on the surface of the globe. These chemicals will prevent sinkings but this Board is looking for bankable paper, and they say, "Gentlemen, let the war proceed if you can't furnish guaranties that will satisfy our critical banking eye."

Time is an essential factor in this war. Here is a concern 80 percent completed which can in 90 days turn out an essential war material; yet it has taken 90 days already to find out why this loan was rejected. If this Board had acted when it should have acted these materials would be coming to the Navy.

This situation should be called to the attention of the country. I presume it would be in order to submit a resolution to investigate this matter, but yet that will not save any time. By the time a committee could investigate and listen to all the conflicts existing in the management of the war effort several months would go past, and this vital material would remain unproduced. I prefer to rely on public opinion and the response that all administrators must finally make to that opinion. It may be that the President is busily engaged at this very moment in bringing about a clear conception of what must be done in directing this war effort. Surely departments and agencies of the Government must see eye to eye if we are to have any clean-cut program of fighting this war. I think we will win the war no matter how we bungle things up with confused administrators, but we could bring about the end much sooner if there were some unity of effort.

Let me further call your attention to the facilities we already have in North Dakota to move the products and by-products of plants such as are planned by the Western Carbon & Chemical Co. The coastal line of the Great Northern Railroad and the Northern Pacific Railroad go directly through this field; add to that the Soo Line and the Milwaukee and you have four major railroads tapping this immense deposit of lignite. This plant was erected at Minot, N. Dak., the intersecting point of the Great Northern and the Soo Line. The Northern Pacific taps the coal fields of Beulah, and the entire length of the Kildeer Line, and also Dickinson and points west. The Milwaukee taps the great coal deposits in southwestern North Dakota. From the standpoint of railroad facilities no expense is needed, because those roads are already there. Is there any other point in the lignite fields where we already have these necessary facilities which can be used without Government money to operate them? Yet the directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation say a plant could be erected at less expense elsewhere in the lignite field, after knowing full well that this plant is already 80 percent completed without any Government assistance.

With these well-developed and actively operating railroads, the products of this company can be shipped to plants at the west coast or east to the head of the Lakes, or by direct railroad routes to the eastern seaboard. The char which will be so badly needed by the iron mines of northern Minnesota in processing sponge iron can be landed by direct line from Minot to the mines. And the Bureau of Mines has already approved this program.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. How many million tons of lignite coal does the gentleman estimate there are in North Dakota?

Mr. BURDICK. In my State alone we have 600,000,000,000 tons.

Mr. RANKIN. Can the gentleman give us the B. t. u. content of this lignite coal?

Mr. BURDICK. I may say to the gentleman that on August 20, 1942, I made a speech on the floor of this House and put in my remarks the entire content of the lignite coal and showed that the contents of distillation from lignite were superior to those from the brown coal of Europe. The figures to which the gentleman refers are in that speech. I cannot recall them offhand, but I could refer to them.

Mr. RANKIN. The best bituminous coal is 14,000 B. t. u.'s to the pound. The lignite coal in Texas is about 8,000 B. t. u.'s to the pound. The reason I ask this is so that I may be able to figure out just what this coal would amount to when it came to the generation of heat, power, and so forth.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I think we had testimony about that before our Committee on Mines and Mining last year when we went into these various German processes, and I think the western lignites run about 11,000 B. t. u.'s, if I am not mistaken. I think they have a rather superior grade in that section.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I might say to the gentleman from North Dakota that I am very much interested in his remarks. Nearly the whole State of Wyoming is underlaid with large deposits of coal. In fact, it has been estimated that Wyoming has more than 250,000,000,000 tons of coal deposits. Near Gillette, in my State, an open-pit mine has been operating for some time, which has a continuous vein of from 60 to 90 feet of lignite coal, with no dirt or rock seams. This coal can be recovered by removing about 20 feet of top soil, and it has been estimated that the supply will last for many years. A movement has been started in Wyoming to utilize this great deposit of lignite coal in the war effort. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the Bureau of Mines is constructing, at this time, an

experimental sponge-iron plant at the University of Wyoming. The purpose of this plant will be to carry on research work in which the iron ore will be pulverized and also various types of coal will be pulverized and mixed in a mortar kiln, brought to a sufficient heat to produce the sponge iron. Wyoming also has one of the largest iron deposits at Sunrise, and we are very hopeful that the research studies made by the Bureau of Mines at the University of Wyoming in connection with this experiment plant will combine our coal deposits and our iron deposits and enable us to produce vast quantities of sponge iron, not only for immediate purposes in connection with the war effort, but also for commercial purposes after the war.

This is the most progressive measure provided for the development of the West in years and I trust that additional funds will be forthcoming by the Congress to increase the splendid work of the plant.

I know of no better time than now to develop the strategic minerals of Wyoming and the West.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. We had this question up before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and it was testified to there that Texas has 37 billion tons of lignite coal that had about 8,000 B. t. u.'s to the pound, and that was sufficient to produce the present amount of electricity used in Texas for the next 20,000 years. What I am trying to figure is this. The gentleman said there were 600 million tons of coal in his State.

Mr. BURDICK. Six hundred billion tons.

Mr. RANKIN. With that amount of coal in North Dakota, that is a tremendous asset. I doubt if the average Member can grasp what it is.

Mr. BURDICK. If you can visualize a cubic block 6 miles each way, you will have it in mind. Here is one thing that I want to call to your attention. The war map of Europe changes almost every day in Russia as between Russia and Germany, but you will find one town that does not change. That town remains stationary, and that is the city of Orel. When the Germans took that they held on to it, and the reason why they are holding on to it and fighting there today to drive the Russians out of the entire basin is because this town of Orel is the processing and railroad center that services the Donets Basin of Russia. The Donets Basin of Russia is the only available coal Hitler has in sight to run his war machine, and if the Germans lose that basin, then they lose the war, and they came mighty near losing it sometime ago, but they have turned around in the last three weeks, and have driven the Russians back.

Mr. RANKIN. What can this coal be produced at in North Dakota at the mine mouth.

Mr. BURDICK. \$1.15 a ton, strip mining. In England it costs from \$8 to \$10 a ton. The Germans are mining it at \$2.40 per ton.

Mr. RANKIN. I hope the gentleman will put this analysis in his speech to show the B. t. u. per pound.

Mr. BURDICK. My experience is that no one will read a speech even if it is marked and you take it to them. They are very polite and say they will.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not asking this question just to take up the gentleman's time.

Mr. BURDICK. I have set forth all these reasons. Mr. Ickes is for it. Donald Nelson is for it, and yet the board that he himself appointed is not for it.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from a distinguished former Member of this House, Hon. John O'Connor, addressed to Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

"BY YOUR ACTIONS SHALL YE BE JUDGED"

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a former very distinguished Jeffersonian Democratic Member of this House, a very loyal outstanding American, whose patriotism can never be successfully challenged, the Honorable John J. O'Connor, apparently read with appreciation and also with some degree of approval my remarks delivered on this floor last Thursday afternoon. This afternoon in my mail I received from Mr. O'Connor a copy of a letter addressed by him on yesterday to the Reverend Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, of Catholic University, of Washington, D. C. With that interesting letter there was a note from Mr. O'Connor suggesting that this letter might prove interesting to the membership and therefore suggested that I put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. After calling him long distance this afternoon at his New York office to verify the authenticity of the letter and the suggestion, I decided to take the floor even this late in the evening after such a long day because I felt this letter should appear in the body of the RECORD where all the Members may read it the more carefully tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, you know it is a funny thing, but there are those among us who thought that perhaps I was unduly alarmed, perhaps even unto the point of crying "wolf," when I warned this House last Thursday against the potential possibilities of the political use of the great patriotic Office of Civilian Defense organization and especially its unpatriotic block plan. This block plan is but little different in its set-up from the famous cell plan of the Communists, remember that. It can be a very potent weapon in the hands of the Dave Niles-Hardtack Harry Hopkins team of managers behind the scenes for the fourth term. And there is a powerful element in this country who step right in line behind those men in being satisfied in their own minds that a fourth term is essential to the post-war inclusion of these United

States into some form of a world-wide collectivist state. Last Thursday I pointed out how these master political minds might conceivably operate.

The first thing they need is money. The old blank check takes care of that little matter. And there are plenty of shekels hidden away in these tremendous war appropriations. Secondly, they need patronage. There is plenty of that; too much of it under the war effort. And what a marvelous set-up of patronage is immediately provided by the minions hired to merely distribute the various tools, gas masks, arm bands, helmets, whistles, and so forth, that go with the O. C. D. outfits, which, in his recent letter to me, Dean Landis said it was their function to distribute under lease from the Government. Of course, there are a few record clerks, a few administrators, and so forth. And then, lastly, they—Hopkins, Niles & Co.—must have a centralized organization through which they can work. They must have a nucleus through which they can blanket the country. I charged the O. C. D. was potentially that nucleus. There may be those who doubt it. I hope it is not permitted to be brought about. But we sometimes unwittingly let ourselves in for something when our patriotism is appealed to. And so, let us go back a bit into not too-distant political history to see just how Neyhus, Hopkins & Co., can, did, does, and probably will operate in the 1944 fourth-term campaign. Remember the three ingredients—money, patronage, organization—theoretically nonpolitical in character, of course. And so, Mr. Speaker, let me read you this letter from our former colleague, a great American, a great Jeffersonian Democrat, a victim of the purge of 1938 by Niles and Hopkins.

NEW YORK, April 6, 1943.

Rev. Msgr. FULTON J. SHEEN,

Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MONSIGNOR: You may recall me as a former Member of Congress and chairman of the Rules Committee.

The high plane of your Sunday afternoon addresses, especially on Christian justice, so inspires me that I beg leave to address you concerning the following:

There is a man in New York named Edwin P. Banta, residing at 215 East Seventeenth Street, New York City, in the congressional district which I represented for over 15 years. He has just written to me asking that I intercede with you, to ask you to acknowledge, if you will, his several registered letters to you of recent date, and return to him the papers he sent you, including certain photostats which he enclosed.

Although you may have labeled Banta as a "crackpot," I feel sure that if you really understood his background and service you would at least tolerate him, as I have done for years—and ought. In addition, I have helped him financially all I could, because I have felt he got a very raw deal at the hands of the Communist adherents of the administration for what he did while in fact serving our religion and our country.

Because it is stranger than fiction, I make bold to write you part of the story.

In 1938, when I was being "purged" by the President, with aid from many sources, the most effective of which was the Communists, Mr. Banta served my cause.

At what turned out to be at the risk of his life, he duly joined the Communist Party in Manhattan and reported in full to me

the proceedings of the meetings of the Communists in reference to my candidacy for reelection to Congress.

For instance, he reported the agenda, calling in thousands of young men and women Communists throughout the entire city to canvass the district against me, especially those members who looked least like "the type." The order was to conceal their communist adherence. It worked. Those enthusiastic, fanatical atheists outsmart any other political solicitors.

Again, for instance, Mr. Banta reported to me that at one meeting, at which Mr. Earl Browder spoke, he (Browder) told how he had just talked to President Roosevelt, who stated to him that "O'Connor must be licked at any cost." Browder's entree to the White House then was well known. In the preceding June I had been placed No. 1 on the Communist blacklist, at their national convention at Madison Square Garden, because of Nation-wide radio talks I had made against communism.

What support I got during such efforts, or in the election, from certain prelates is still another story now being written for another day.

Suspicion began to fall on Banta in the Communist meetings. The Daily Worker, chief supporter of my opponent, FAY, Roosevelt's candidate, finally caught up with Banta and exposed him as "my man." He was followed, and his life was threatened to such an extent that I arranged bodyguards for him. You may not believe it, but the Communies do get tough sometimes, in packs, in alleys, late at night.

Banta was working on Work Projects Administration. Hopkins got word of his secret activities in my behalf and after an investigation, at which I was also questioned, by Hopkins' first assistant, Banta was thrown off the Work Projects Administration, and all relief rolls, although he was in dire distress and had a sick wife. One of Hopkins' handy men in the purge was Davey Neyhus, alias Niles, now one of the President's secretaries and field marshal for the fourth term. Did you ever get a look at him? If you did, you could just picture him in that Communist strike riot in Lawrence, Mass., some years ago. He spent a good deal of time in traveling between Washington and New York, directing the purge and carrying the sinews—\$25,000 from J. L. Lewis, \$65,000 from the White House. "Tommy" Corcoran and "Ed" Flynn helped, too. They "persuaded" Ben Smith, the Bear of Wall Street, to give up \$50,000 on a promise to be made Ambassador to Russia. He's still waiting.

Meetings of the supervisors of Work Projects Administration—hundreds of them—were held at which they were ordered to go out and work in the campaign against me.

But the particular \$65,000 sent from the White House had dehydrated to \$50,000 by the time it reached Fay's manager, Major Walsh, in the Municipal Building in New York City, where the major, an appointee of Mayor LaGuardia, was conducting the campaign.

The major, now director of the draft in New York City, was so provoked at the shriveling that he personally went to the White House to have a show-down.

Gerald V. Cruise, about to expire as a member of the New York Power Commission (a job which I obtained for him) and who acted as liaison man for Corcoran in the purge, was questioned in respect to the funds transmitted from Washington to New York. Of course, there was no accounting in Washington or New York for the upward of \$200,000 so spent in the New York purge.

I only review the foregoing, narrated in the writings of Dr. Stanley High, because in all this conspiracy, Banta became a victim.

I was instrumental in having Banta testify before the Dies Committee, which I helped create and of which act I am very proud. He gave very valuable information to the committee about communistic, subversive, un-American activities. That made Banta's plight all the worse, because the Dies committee was taboo with the administration.

All that only led to increased hounding of Banta by all the Federal forces in New York, under the Lieutenantcy of Hopkins, Niles, and Browder. He was a marked man—from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue to Union Square. How he ever lived through it, I often wonder.

Despite any annoyance from his prolific letter writing, I have helped him through all the 7 years, as best I could, and I feel deeply that I could not do more. He is such a better American than many people you run into these days.

Through the proper pen, his story could well be a saga of what has happened to our country in the last decade.

Most respectfully yours,

JOHN O'CONNOR.

So, Mr. Speaker, by your actions shall ye be judged. There is now no more W. P. A. But there is an O. C. D. The blank checks are here, in astronomical amounts. The patronage—well, read your daily newspapers. Wake up, America!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. BOYKIN, Mr. ELLIOTT, Mr. OUTLAND, Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts, and Mr. WILSON (at the request of Mr. LANHAM), indefinitely, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier today in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 52. An act for the relief of Hazel M. Lewis;

S. 257. An act for the relief of Christine Lund;

S. 258. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to consider the claim of Lew O. Calhoun;

S. 404. An act for the relief of Richard Barker; and

S. 854. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 218. An act for the relief of H. F. Mathis;

H. R. 227. An act for the relief of the Tours Apartment Hotel;

H. R. 402. An act for the relief of Frank T. Been;

H. R. 538. An act for the relief of Thelma Cannon McGroary;

H. R. 605. An act for the relief of Shumate Investment Co.;

H. R. 1128. An act for the relief of Bernice James;

H. R. 1131. An act for the relief of the estate of Ola Fowler;

H. R. 1276. An act for the relief of Raymond W. Baldwin, Mattie Baldwin, and Clement B. Baldwin;

H. R. 1279. An act for the relief of Lee Watts;

H. R. 1459. An act for the relief of Albertine Nast;

H. R. 1639. An act for the relief of Frank and Paulina Rublein and Mrs. Ethel Bowers.;

H. R. 1691. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay the costs of transportation of certain civilian employees, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1724. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost incident to the emergency evacuation of the United States Antarctic Expedition's east base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2079. An act to effectuate the intent of the Congress as expressed in section I, paragraph (k) of Public Law 846, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 24, 1942, by adding to the list of institutions named in said paragraph the name of the American Tree Association, an institution similar to the institutions so named.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 8, 1943, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARING

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

As advised in notice of March 10, 1943, Congressman BATES of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee which has arranged a schedule of hearings throughout the country which will compel Congressman BATES of Massachusetts to be absent from Washington on April 8 and also April 15.

The chairman of the committee and the Commissioner of Fisheries will be out of town on intervening dates, which will necessitate a further postponement of the hearing until May 13, 1943. You are hereby notified that the hearings scheduled for April 8 and postponed until April 15 have been postponed to May 13, 1943, at 10 a. m., at which time the hearings will follow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

307. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend sections 2 and 4 of the act approved June 27, 1942, entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy, Marine

Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

308. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 7 (c) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

309. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing the Postmaster General to use post-office clerks and city letter carriers interchangeably; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. Supplemental report to part 2 to accompany H. R. 653. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934 (Rept. No. 66). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 189. Resolution authorizing printing of a revised edition of a digest of State laws affecting the hard of hearing and the deaf; without amendment (Rept. No. 348). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 349. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 700. An act suspending certain provisions of sections 12B and 19 of the Federal Reserve Act until 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution of the Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 350). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 2417 (by request). A bill to amend section 8 of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 2418. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines who have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2419. A bill to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "Assistant Clerk"; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 2420. A bill to prohibit the Federal Government from aiding in the production of rice outside the United States, its Territories, or possessions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana:

H. R. 2421. A bill to provide for reduced fares for the transportation by railroads and

buses during the present war of members of the land and naval forces; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 2422. A bill to amend section 1 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2423. A bill to amend section 1532 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2424. A bill to amend section 1 (a) of the Carriers Taxing Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2425. A bill to amend section 1 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 2426. A bill to supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of greatly needed highways and bridges, to eliminate hazards at railroad grade crossings, to provide for the immediate preparation of plans and acquisition of rights-of-way to cushion the post-war conversion to peacetime economy and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 2427. A bill to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 2428. A bill to repeal the Chinese exclusion laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2429. A bill to repeal the Chinese exclusion laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to suspend the provisions of the laws relating to compulsory retirement for age of officers of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take action necessary to effect the retirement of the Federal Government from the field of tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider legislation as soon as possible granting unto the people of Alaska the right to elect their own Governor; to the Committee on the Territories.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. R. 2430. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Morton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 2431. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nathan Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PATTON:

H. R. 2432. A bill for the relief of Otis Hall; to the Committee on Claims

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

436. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of Ida Steiner and 60 other citizens of Wells and Adams Counties, Ind., urging immediate passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

437. By Mr. ENGEL: Petition of Mrs. Phebe H. Benton, Mrs. R. I. Bonney, and Mrs. V. W. Peck, of Manistee County Pomona Grange No. 21, urging Congress to give consideration to the issuance of honor certificates to all boys who are "frozen" to farm work and who are thereby prevented from serving in the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

438. By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution of George Dilboy Post, No. 529, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, of Somerville, Mass., memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide for mandatory war-risk insurance for enlisted men in the armed forces; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

439. Also, vote of the Department of Public Utilities of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts opposing Federal legislation interfering with the power of that department to regulate rates for air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

440. By Mr. BARRY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, requesting the Congress to take appropriate action to eliminate any delay in the final attainment of citizenship on the applications of petitioners of Italian origin who have demonstrated themselves to be loyal and trustworthy, notwithstanding a state of war between the United States and Italy; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

441. By Mr. ROLPH: Senate Resolution No. 18 of the State of California, adopted March 29, 1943, relative to the construction of a multiple-purpose dam on the upper reaches of the Stanislaus River to restrain the usual recurring excess flow of water of said river and to utilize the water so impounded for the generation of electric power, for irrigation, for domestic water supply, and for other useful and beneficial purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

442. Also, resolution No. A-55 of the Railroad Commission of the State of California, opposing House bill No. 1012 and Senate bill No. 246; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

443. By Mr. SPRINGER: Petition of many citizens of Connorsville, East Chicago, Scottsburg, LaGrange, Wolcottville, Auburn, Corunna, Howe, Peru, Wabash, Monroeville, Akron, Rochester, and Silver Lake, Ind., urging the adoption of House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

444. By Mr. BURCHILL of New York: Memorial of the Senate of the State of New York, that the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, respectfully memorialized to take appropriate action to eliminate any delay in the final attainment of citizenship on the part of applicants of Italian origin who have demonstrated themselves to be loyal and worthy, notwithstanding the existence of a state of war between the United States and Italy; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

445. By Mr. CASE: Petition of Casper Le Compte and others of the White Horse Community, requesting that certain changes be made in present Indian laws and regulations; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

446. By Mr. SULLIVAN: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 17 of the Nevada Legislature, memorializing Congress to grant relief to the gold-mining industry; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

447. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of Rev. Russell Weller and 46 other residents of Decatur and Adams Counties, Ind., urging immediate adoption of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

448. Also, petition of Mrs. R. B. Click and 33 other residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., urging immediate passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

449. By Mr. WELCH: Senate Joint Resolution No. 18 of the California Legislature, relative to the construction of a dam on the Stanislaus River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

450. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Flatbush Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to appointing a permanent commission to study and define the peace aims of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 8, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, April 6, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, Thy glory the heavens are telling and the earth showeth Thy handiwork. Across the star-strewn spaces, in all the order and majesty of the universe we catch an assuring glimpse of Thy garments vast and white with a hem that we can recognize. Behind all the tangled threads of human affairs we are conscious that hands not our hands are working out the bright pattern of an eternal purpose.

In the heat and burden of our swiftly ebbing day may we be the agents of Thy beneficent will for mankind, with honor unsullied, playing our part in the life of our times. With full purpose of heart, wherever we are called to stand in this epic hour, may we strike our blow for the truth of God and the freedom of man.

"Set our feet on lofty places,
Gird our lives that they may be
Armored with all Christlike graces
In the fight to make men free.
Grant us wisdom, grant us courage,
That we fail not man nor Thee."

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Wednesday, April 7, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Green	Overton
Austin	Guffey	Pepper
Bailey	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hatch	Reed
Barkley	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bone	Hayden	Reynolds
Brewster	Hill	Robertson
Bridges	Holman	Russell
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	Lucas	Truman
Chavez	McCarran	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McKellar	Van Nuys
Danaher	McNary	Wagner
Davis	Maloney	Wallgren
Downey	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Murdoch	White
George	Nye	Wiley
Gerry	O'Daniel	Willis
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent on an inspection tour of military camps.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent, holding hearings in the West on behalf of the Special Committee to Investigate Small Business Enterprises.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is absent on official business as a member of the Small Business Committee of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 700) suspending certain provisions of sections 12B and 19 of the Federal